1982

The Resource Specialist Role In California: An Analysis Of Perceptions

Eleanor Marie Landon
University of the Pacific

THE RESOURCE SPECIALIST ROLE IN CALIFORNIA: AN ANALYSIS OF PERCEPTIONS

A Dissertation

Presented to

the Faculty of the Graduate School

University of the Pacific

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

by

Eleanor Marie Landon

April, 1982

This dissertation, written and submitted by

Eleanor Marie Landon

is approved for recommendation to the Committee on Graduate Studies, University of the Pacific

Dean of the School or Department Chairman:

Oscar T Jarvis

Dr. Oscar T. Jarvis

Dissertation Committee:

Roger Reimer Chairman

Dr. Roger Reimer

David G. Fletcher

Dr. David Fletcher

Estelle Lau

Dr. Estelle Lau

Dr. Lawrence McQuerrey

Joseph McQuerrey

Dr. Joseph McQuerrey

Dated April 29, 1982

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation could not have been completed without the assistance, encouragement and support of many individuals. For that, I extend deep and sincere appreciation to

Superintendent Evelyn B. Kipp and the Newark Unified School District for supporting, endorsing and encouraging both the study and the researcher;

Dr. David Fletcher, Dr. Estelle Lau, Dr. Lawrence McQuerrey and Dr. Joe Roberts, dissertation committee members, for their valuable input, expertise and time;

Dr. Bobby Hopkins, unofficial committee member, for his many consultations regarding the statistical portions of the study.

An enormous thank you goes to Connie Jones, friend, secretary, and loyal supporter, for typing draft after draft of this dissertation under incredible pressures, always assuring me that we would make it.

Much affection and appreciation goes to Dr. Betty Pacheco, colleague, friend and dissertation trail blazer, whose help and unfailing optimism so often kept me going.

A very special thank you goes to Dr. Roger Reimer, dissertation chairperson, advisor and friend, for giving so much time and energy to critique, inspire, encourage and support the writer and the writing at every step of the seemingly endless dissertation process.

Finally, I thank my family and friends for being there when I needed them and for lovingly accepting the inevitable demands inherent in writing a dissertation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

With the passage of Public Law 94-142, The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, the United States Government attempted to insure an equal educational opportunity for all school aged handicapped youngsters. Specific mandates of PL 94-142 included the right to a "free and appropriate education" to be provided in the "least restrictive environment," the right to an individualized education program (IEP) tailored to meet each handicapped student's unique needs, the right to non-discriminatory assessment and placement, and the right to procedural due process.[1]

Three major court rulings provided the impetus for the passage of PL 94-142. The historic Brown decision of 1954 established that racially segregated public schools violated the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution and stated that no child could be expected to succeed in life if he or she was denied the opportunity for an education.[2] The recognition that education is a "fundamental interest," i.e., of sufficient importance to be protected by the Fourteenth Amendment, was further emphasized by the Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children (PARC) consent agreement of 1972,

---

[1]U. S. Congress, Public Law 94-142, Education for All Handicapped Children Act (November, 1975).

[2]Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U. S. 483, 493 (1954),

which, in substance, guaranteed that a free, appropriate education must be made available to educable mentally retarded children.[3] Later that same year, the Mills decision required that a free, appropriate education be available to any handicapped child.[4] These rulings, as well as the political activity of concerned individuals and organizations, led to the development and subsequent passage of PL 94-142.

The impact of this significant piece of federal legislation was felt nation-wide as all fifty states struggled to devise comprehensive plans which would, in fact, make available a free, appropriate education in the least restrictive environment for all of their school aged handicapped youngsters not later than September 1, 1978. Federal regulations stated that a "continuum of alternative placements" which included an array of instructional options to accommodate the diverse needs of handicapped youngsters was to be made available in every state and to be outlined in each state plan to implement PL 94-142.[5]

The educational placement continuum ranges from the least restrictive setting of the regular classroom to the progressively more restrictive alternative placements of special classes, special schools and education provided in home, hospital or institutional settings. Although the changes occurring within each of these program options are having a substantial impact on education, it is the interpretation and the implementation of the first alternative, education in regular

---

[3]Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children v. Pennsylvania, 343 F. Supp. 279 (E.D. Pa. 1972).

[4]Mills v. D. C. Board of Education, 348 F. Supp. 866 (D.C. 1972).

[5]Federal Register, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, (August, 1977), Sec. 121a.551.

classrooms (popularly known as mainstreaming), which has generated the greatest discussion and concern.

The Master Plan for Special Education is California legislation designed to implement the mandates of PL 94-142. Included in the Master Plan is a mainstreaming component known as the Resource Specialist Program. This program is designed for handicapped students who can be mainstreamed into regular education classes for the majority of their school day.[6] Each Resource Specialist Program is to be under the direction of a Resource Specialist--an experienced, credentialed special education teacher who holds an additional credential called the Resource Specialist Certificate of Competence.

Resource Specialist Programs are legally required to provide the following minimum services to the identified, handicapped students assigned to them: (1) special education instruction and services, (2) assistance and information for students and parents (3) consultation services, resource information and materials for parents and regular educators, (4) monitoring student progress on a regular basis, (5) coordination of the IEP process and (6) coordination of special education services with the regular education program.[7] Although it is suggested in the legislation that the Resource Specialist is to be responsible for some of these program goals, the responsibility is not clearly or exclusively assigned. Further, the Resource Specialist role statements are not prioritized nor are they always clearly defined in existing legislation, current regulations or Resource Specialist credentialing

---

[6]California Education Code, Part 30, Special Education Programs, Section 56362 (a) (1).

[7]Ibid., Section 56362 (a) (2) (3) (4) (5).

requirements.

Resource Specialist Programs have been in existence on a limited scale since 1975 when California began implementation of the original Master Plan for Special Education by funding six pilot Master Plan Regions in the state. Each year additional Master Plan Regions were added until, by June, 1980, twenty-one were in operation throughout California. Continuation of this gradual implementation was halted in July, 1980, with the passage of SB 1870, the "new" Master Plan. According to the provisions of SB 1870, all districts not part of approved Master Plan Regions in California were to be in full compliance with all of the Master Plan provisions by the fall of 1982. The establishment of this two year time line created a tremendous demand for Resource Specialist Programs and for competent Resource Specialists to staff them.

Anticipating the need for qualified Resource Specialists, the authors of SB 1870 included a charge to the Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing (CTPL) to establish a list of Resource Specialist competencies and to develop rules and regulations governing the issuance of the new Resource Specialist Certificate of Competence. Since the passage of SB 1870 in 1980, CTPL has issued two competency lists for Resource Specialists. Both the original and the revised lists lack clarity, are not comprehensive and do not prioritize the functions or competencies. Thus, neither CTPL's list of competencies nor the general Resource Specialist Program goals outlined in SB 1870, furnish sufficient information to define adequately the Resource Specialist role. Without a clear, precise delineation of the role, it is virtually impossible to determine specifically what Resource Specialist training programs should include, how to evaluate incumbent Resource Specialists,

or how to screen effectively candidates for new Resource Specialist positions.

The State of California is not alone in its difficulty in defining this important role. In a comprehensive review of special education resource room programs across the country, Sindelar and Deno suggested that adequate verification of critical program components and functions is indeed lacking.[8] Sargent concurred and identified additional concerns which included the need to establish priorities of resource room functions and time allocations of persons who fill the resource teacher role.[9] Lerner then pointed out that the lack of role specificity for resource teachers invited confusion, which "has a negative effect upon daily operations in the schools, and affects teacher-preparation institutions, certification agencies and professional organizations."[10]

One purpose of California's original "pilot approach" to implementation of the Master Plan for Special Education was to learn from the successes and failures of early experimental programs. Just as the literature reflects much diversity and debate about the role of the resource teacher, there is a lack of clarity about the tasks which make up California's Resource Specialist role.[11] Miltenberger suggested

---

[8]Paul Sindelar and Stanley Deno, "The Effectiveness of Resource Programming," The Journal of Special Education, 12 (Spring, 1978), 17-28.

[9]Laurence Sargent, "Resource Teacher Time Utilization: An Observational Study," Exceptional Children, 47 (March, 1981), 420-25.

[10]Janet Lerner, "Symposium #11 - Remedial Reading and Learning Disabilities: Are They the Same or Different?" Journal of Special Education, 9 (Summer, 1975), 117.

[11]Anne Smith, Mainstreaming: Idea and Actuality (New York State Education Department, Albany, Division for Handicapped Children, January, 1976).

Resource Specialist "role clarification as the first step in addressing the mandates of mainstreaming and the moral mandates of education."[12] The development of a comprehensive, prioritized Resource Specialist role description is critical if California's primary mainstreaming program is to be successful.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to provide a comprehensive, prioritized description of the major tasks of the Resource Specialist role as perceived by the three groups of educators most directly and consistently involved with the educational mainstreaming of handicapped youngsters in pilot California Resource Specialist Programs. The three groups included (1) site administrators responsible for the regular and Resource Specialist Programs in their schools, (2) classroom teachers with Resource Specialist Program students mainstreamed into their classes, and (3) Resource Specialists operating site Resource Specialist Programs.

Specifically this study was designed to answer the following research questions:

1. What is the relative importance of the various tasks which comprise the Resource Specialist role, as perceived by site administrators, classroom teachers and Resource Specialists?
2. What is the relative amount of time spent on the various tasks which comprise the Resource Specialist role, as

---

[12]Jerry Miltenberger, "Mainstreaming--A Different Approach" Education Unlimited, 1 (October, 1979), 53.

perceived by the three educator groups?

3. Are there significant differences among the three educator groups regarding their perceptions of the relative importance of the tasks which make up the Resource Specialist role?
4. Are there significant differences among the three educator groups regarding their perceptions of the relative amount of time spent on the tasks which make up the Resource Specialist role?
5. Is there a significant difference in the way elementary and secondary educators perceive the relative importance of the tasks which make up the Resource Specialist role?
6. Is there a significant difference in the way elementary and secondary educators perceive the relative amount of time spent on the tasks which make up the Resource Specialist role?
7. Is there a significant difference in the way Resource Specialists perceive the relative importance of specific tasks in the Resource Specialist role based on whether they have been Resource Specialists two years or less or more than two years?
8. Is there a significant difference in the way Resource Specialists perceive the relative amount of time spent on each task based on whether they have been Resource Specialists two years or less or more than two years?
9. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of site administrators, classroom teachers and Resource Specialists regarding the amount of time which should be spent on each Resource Specialist task?

In order to respond to these questions, a comprehensive review of

the available information pertaining to the role of special education resource teachers was conducted, and a composite list of the most relevant and most commonly occurring tasks was developed. A forced choice Resource Specialist Role Survey was developed using the list. Survey respondents were asked (1) to rank each task in order of its perceived importance, (2) to rank from most to least the amount of time perceived to be spent on each task, and (3) to indicate whether the amount of time spent was sufficient, should be increased or should be decreased. Completed surveys were then analyzed in light of the research questions.

Significance of the Study

The California Legislature designated the Resource Specialist Program as the primary delivery system for mainstreaming handicapped students in response to the mandates of PL 94-142. State legislation passed in July, 1980, required that by September, 1982, all California school districts must be in full compliance with all provisions of the Master Plan for Special Education. Part of that compliance requires that Resource Specialist Programs be in operation and available to all handicapped students for whom such programs are appropriate.

Each Resource Specialist Program must, by law, be staffed by an experienced, certificated special education teacher who has an advanced credential--the Resource Specialist Certificate of Competence. It was important, therefore, to establish a clear, comprehensive, prioritized list of the tasks which make up the Resource Specialist role in order to facilitate the optimum functioning of California's major mainstreaming model. Establishing and analyzing the perceptions of educators having field-based experience with pilot Resource Specialist Programs was critical to the development of a Resource Specialist role description

which could be used as a basis for decision making about preservice and inservice training programs, as well as hiring and evaluation practices.

Limitations of the Study

This study was limited to site administrators responsible for the regular educational programs and Resource Specialist Programs in their schools, classroom teachers with Resource Specialist Program students mainstreamed into their classes and Resource Specialists who staffed the existing Resource Specialist Programs. The individuals in these three groups were selected from Master Plan Region schools in California which were operating pilot Resource Specialist Programs in the Spring of 1981.

Definition of Terms

The terms used in this study are defined as follows:

Least Restrictive Environment: A term from PL 94-142 which stipulates "that to the maximum extent appropriate, handicapped children, including children in public or private institutions or other care facilities, are educated with children who are not handicapped."[13]

Mainstreaming: "A form of educational programming that integrates special needs and non-special needs children in regular classrooms."[14]

Resource Room: "An instructional setting which a handicapped

---

[13]Federal Register, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare (August, 1977), Sec. 121a.550(1).

[14]Samuel J. Meisels, "First Steps in Mainstreaming," Young Children, 33 (November, 1977), 4.

child enters for services for specific periods of time on a regularly scheduled basis."[15] This setting "provides resources for handicapped students and their teachers. At this time there is no standardization of the resource room model."[16]

Resource Teacher: A special education teacher proficient in performing duties related to meeting the needs of mainstreamed, handicapped students, their teachers and their parents.[17]

Resource Specialist Program: A kind of resource room program designated, defined and specified in California law and regulation to facilitate the mainstreaming of handicapped students.

Resource Specialist: A California special education teacher holding an advanced Certificate of Competence and operating a Resource Specialist Program designed to facilitate and promote successful mainstreaming of handicapped youngsters.

Elementary Educator: A site administrator, classroom teacher or Resource Specialist working in K-6th grade schools with primarily self-contained as opposed to departmentalized classes.

Secondary Educator: A site administrator, classroom teacher or Resource Specialist working in 7-12th grade schools with departmentalized programs, primarily.

---

[15]Lee Wiederholt, "Planning Resource Rooms for the Mildly Handicapped," Focus on Exceptional Children, 10 (January, 1974), 6.

[16]Margaret Hawisher and Mary Calhoun, The Resource Room (Columbus: Charles Merrill, 1978), p. 3.

[17]Lee Wiederholt, Donald Hammill and Virginia Brown, The Resource Teacher: A Guide to Effective Practices (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1978), pp. 11-13.

Overview of the Study

The Resource Specialist position is a critical one in California's Master Plan for Special Education. As the special educator most directly involved in mainstreaming handicapped students into the regular education program, the Resource Specialist has a multi-faceted job requiring diverse skills and duties. Without a realistic, comprehensive, prioritized description of the Resource Specialist role, uncertainty, ambiguity and conflicting role expectations could easily occur, thus jeopardizing the success of the mainstreaming effort. Institutions of higher education are presently developing Resource Specialist training and credentialing programs. To make these programs effective, professors of special education must know precisely what the Resource Specialist role entails so that content and competencies can be developed which equip Resource Specialists to meet the demands of their multi-faceted role. In addition, by September, 1982, all California school districts must have Resource Specialist Programs available for qualifying handicapped students. This short time line makes it imperative that school district personnel involved in the hiring and evaluation of Resource Specialists have knowledge of what the Resource Specialist role actually is in order to staff Resource Specialist Programs with those individuals who can truly facilitate the mainstreaming effort.

This study is organized into five chapters. In Chapter 1 the introduction, purpose, significance and limitations of the study as well as a definition of key terms are presented. Chapter 2 is the literature review which presents an historical perspective, an analysis of various special education resource room models and a veiw of California's

Resource Specialist role. Included in Chapter 3 are the survey development, sample selection, and the procedures utilized to obtain and treat survey data. Chapter 4 includes a presentation of the data, while in Chapter 5 there is a summary of the study, a discussion of each Resource Specialist Role Survey task, conclusions of the study and recommendations for further study.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The literature reviewed in this chapter focuses on the following areas: (1) An Historical Perspective, (2) Special Education Resource Room Models, and (3) California's Resource Specialist Role.

An Historical Perspective

Society's view of individual worth, potential and capability has undergone many changes since the beginning of recorded history. Most of these changes reflected the economic, religious, political, philosophical and/or scientific thought of the time and resulted in treatment of the individual which was concomitant with a given outlook. Goffman pointed out that "the normal and the stigmatized are not persons but rather perspectives."[1] And these perspectives have changed greatly over the centuries.

Generally today, western society views the individual as a creature of worth and dignity whose full potential and capability are yet to be fully realized. This view has fostered increased acceptance and understanding of a wider range of individual differences than ever before, and a commitment to educate and train each individual according to his/her needs and abilities. Because of this current view, the physically and mentally handicapped are one segment of American society

---

[1]Erving Goffman, Stigma (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1963), p. 138.

whose individual differences are better understood and accepted now than ever before. Yet it has only been within the past decade that the Federal government has legislated a massive commitment to appropriate training and education of the handicapped. This commitment has generated much controversy over how and where this education should be provided.

Overall, society's treatment of mentally and physically handicapped individuals has become progressively more humane, understanding and accepting as one looks from the earliest times to the present. Several historians have identified distinct eras in the treatment of handicapped individuals. The first era which is generally discussed encompasses pre-Christian times when the handicapped were exploited, ridiculed and often exterminated. The second era often identified in the literature includes the onset and subsequent impact of Christianity from the sixth to the seventeenth centuries. Christianity brought with it pity, protection and custodial care of handicapped persons. The eighteenth and nineteenth centuries comprise the third major historical era which is generally characterized by the motivation to educate rather than merely to contain the severely handicapped. The twentieth century marks the fourth era and includes attention to the special needs of less severely handicapped individuals as well as major changes in attitudes regarding education of the handicapped.[2]

These four historical divisions are by no means discrete, for

---

[2]James M. Kauffman and James S. Payne, Mental Retardation (Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, 1975), pp. 4-6; Norris G. Harding, ed., Behavior of Exceptional Children (2d ed., Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, 1978), pp. 98-100; Donald L. MacMillan, Mental Retardation in School and Society (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1977), pp. 10-17.

within each there were remnants of past attitudes and behaviors as well as precursors of the future. For purposes of discussion, these four eras serve to illustrate the changes in treatment of the handicapped which reflect society's changing perspective of exceptional individuals. An examination of each era illustrates more fully the changes which evolved from pre-Christian times to the present.

According to Kauffman and Payne, primitive societies in their struggle for basic survival could not support any person in the community who did not contribute to its welfare. Individuals who were physically or mentally incapacitated were summarily and expeditiously eliminated. Non-normal infants were killed outright or ritually abandoned to die. The same system was often used with older community members who were no longer able to contribute to the general welfare of the group because of age, infirmity or other handicapping condition.[3]

Later, as survival became easier and society more advanced, some handicapped individuals were allowed to live; but mainly because they were useful in other ways. In ancient Rome and Greece, for instance, many affluent citizens kept physically and mentally handicapped individuals to provide entertainment for themselves and their guests. MacMillan recounts that the wife of Seneca, the famous statesman and philosopher, kept a blind imbecile for her amusement.[4] Royal and noble households and entourages often included dwarfs and retardates who functioned as resident clown and jesters. Still, for the vast majority of

---

[3]Kauffman and Payne, op. cit., p. 5.

[4]Donald L. MacMillan, Mental Retardation in School and Society (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1977), p. 10.

handicapped individuals, death through murder, abandonment, neglect or abuse was the most common fate.

The advent and development of Christianity from the sixth to the seventeenth centuries brought with it an amazing range of attitudes toward and treatments of mentally and physically disabled persons. Depending upon the time and place, handicapped individuals were revered as Godly innocents, feared as tools of the devil, tolerated as fools, persecuted as witches, worshipped as prophets, suspected of having supernatural powers and abilities given by God or the devil, or considered good luck omens because they were believed to be divinely blessed.[5] Despite the diversity of beliefs which characterized the Christian Era up to the seventeenth century, there steadily grew a feeling of pity and compassion for less fortunate beings and a belief that "God's creatures" should be protected and cared for if they were not able to care for themselves. By the end of the 17th century, many churches supported and operated asylums which provided shelter, food and clothing for the physically and mentally handicapped as well as for the poor and the orphaned. While this organized custodial care often represented significantly better treatment of the handicapped than had existed before, there were no attempts made to educate, to rehabilitate or to treat any handicapping condition of the individuals housed in the asylums. In fact, some accounts of asylums depicted conditions so barbaric and primitive and keepers so cruel and abusive that one wonders whether living there was any protection at all.

---

[5]Ibid., p. 11; Kauffman and Payne, p. 6; Walter H. Ehlers, Curtis H. Krishef and Jon C. Prothero, An Introduction to Mental Retardation (2d ed., Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, 1977), p. 16.

Nowrey rendered this account of insane asylums in the seventeenth century:

> The buildings were untenable, the cells were narrow, cold and dripping, unlit and unventilated, and furnished with a litter of straw, which was rarely changed and often infested with vermin. Men crouched there covered with filth, in hideous lairs in which one would have hesitated to confine a beast. The insane, imprisoned here, were at the mercy of brutal keepers, who were often malefactors from the prisons. The patients were loaded with chains and tied with ropes like unruly convicts.[6]

During the eighteenth century, European social, political and educational reform aided the growing number of individuals who were expressing interest in the causes, therapeutic treatment and education of physically and mentally handicapped individuals.[7] The older, traditional ways of living and thinking were giving way to exploration of the physical sciences, the physical environment, human potential and human reason.[8] More and more individuals promoted a belief in the innate goodness of man and the equality of all men. Several countries, among them Germany, France, Switzerland and England, began experimenting with innovative schools which included as students slaves, prisoners, the poor and the handicapped.[9]

Three Frenchmen of the eighteenth century laid much of the foundation for the current perspective in society that the potential of handicapped individuals can be realized through training and education.

---

[6]James E. Nowrey, "A Brief Synopsis of Mental Deficiency," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 49 (September, 1945), 343.

[7]MacMillan, op. cit., pp. 12-13.

[8]S. E. Frost, Jr., and Kenneth P. Bailey, Historical and Philosophical Foundations of Western Education (2d ed., Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, 1973), pp. 291-92.

[9]MacMillan, op. cit., p. 13.

These men were Jacob Pereire, Valentin Hauy and Jean Itard.[10] Pereire was a French physician who spent many years developing a sign language and method of mathematical calculation to be used by deaf mutes. Pereire wrote extensively and demonstrated his methods of teaching the deaf at the Academy of Science in Paris where he attracted the attention of many educators and philosophers as well as that of King Louis XV. The king became so interested in Pereire's work that he brought the physician to court and created an awareness among royalty and nobility of education for the deaf.[11] Hauy, relying heavily on Pereire's writings, adapted his teaching methods for use with blind students and opened the first school for the blind in 1784.[12] By the close of the eighteenth century, Itard had written of his five year experiment in educating and civilizing a small boy whom Itard had found living alone in the wilds of Avyron, France. Although Itard himself was disappointed that the boy, Victor, did not achieve all Itard had hoped for, Itard's work demonstrated that through education and training a presumably "hopeless" child could learn.[13]

The industrial revolution of the nineteenth century had a profound impact upon society's view and treatment of the handicapped. The need for more and better trained workers for the rapidly developing and expanding industries of Europe and America made it economically expedient to educate and train any individual, handicapped or not, who could

---

[10]Barbara Aiello, "Especially for Special Educators: A Sense of Our Own History," Exceptional Children, 42 (February, 1976), 244-52.

[11]MacMillan, loc. cit. [12]Ibid.

[13]Walter H. Ehlers, Curtis H. Krishef and Jon C. Prothero, An Introduction to Mental Retardation (2d. ed., Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, 1977), pp. 17-18.

become useful to the newly industrialized societies. The number and diversity of jobs available and the limited number of qualified workers for them ushered in the exploitation of children as well as a significant growth in the training and education of many handicapped individuals.[14] This training and education was often done in the asylums which had previously only given custodial care.

Reynolds reported that by the nineteenth century asylums for the deaf, the blind, the mentally retarded and the mentally ill were well established in many European countries.[15] These asylums provided more than the protective care of previous centuries. Based upon Pereire's work with the deaf, principles to educate and train individuals with a variety of handicaps were tried and found successful. Edward Seguin pioneered in France a new kind of residential asylum for the mentally retarded. Seguin not only taught the inmates, but he also provided on-the-job training to individuals who were interested in teaching in institutions for the handicapped. Seguin's training school model which brought in apprentices to observe, emulate and later disseminate teachings of the "masters" became successful and was well established in France by mid-century.[16]

Transferring Seguin's methodology to novice teachers expanded the outlook for education of the handicapped, brought new hope to handicapped individuals and their families and established a concept of

---

[14]James M. Kauffman and James S. Payne, Mental Retardation (Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, 1975), p. 6.

[15]Maynard C. Reynolds, "Education of Handicapped Students: Some Areas of Confusion," Phi Delta Kappan, 61 (May, 1980), 603-4.

[16]Aiello, op. cit., p. 246.

training and treatment which was to be used with the physically and mentally disabled in subsequent years.[17] The concept of residential institutions with live-in teachers emigrated to America with European educators early in the nineteenth century and gained strength through the remainder of the century in many parts of the United States.[18]

According to Aiello, Thomas Gallaudet established the first residential school for the deaf in Connecticut in 1817. Three years later the first training school for the blind in Massachusetts was operating, and, by mid-century, Samuel Gridley Howe had established the Institute for Idiotic Children in Massachusetts.[19] With support from individuals such as Horace Mann and Dorothea Dix, the residential school movement had, by mid-century, produced separate schools for the blind, deaf, epileptic, mentally retarded, mentally ill and orphaned.[20] These special schools provided the only comprehensive educational opportunities available to handicapped individuals until compulsory education laws forced change upon the various states.

The impact of compulsory education in America, which began in 1852, and its effect of requiring public school attendance for every youngster within a given age range in nearly all states by the turn of the century, brought into sharp focus and on a massive scale the question of what to do with students who did not "fit" into the system.

---

[17] Ibid., p. 248.

[18] Frances P. Connor, "The Past is Prologue: Teacher Preparation in Special Education," Exceptional Children, 42 (April, 1976), 366-80.

[19] Aiello, op. cit., p. 246.

[20] Samuel A. Kirk, Educating Exceptional Children (2d. ed., Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1972), p. 6.

Students with varying degrees and types of handicapping conditions, non-typical students whose behavior and/or learning needs were non-traditional, students who could not keep pace academically, and students who were not motivated by traditional means were all required to be in the public education system. There were basically three ways that the problems these kinds of students presented were handled. The students were either included in the regular program with no special help, put into special segregated classes for the handicapped, or excluded from school as they had been in the past.

The most innovative response to compulsory education for the handicapped population was the establishment of separate special classes within the public schools for specific categories of severely handicapped children. These special day classes became an alternative for many youngsters previously schooled in residential institutions. Public school special classes were part of the public educational system and subject to the laws and regulations which governed their operation.[21] However, each categorical, segregated class was only for students with a specific handicap (blind, deaf, etc.), and there was no integration with non-handicapped students in regular classes or even with students in other special classes for youngsters with other types of handicaps.

O'Connor reported that the first public school special class for deaf children was begun in Boston in 1869. Other states then followed suit. Providence, Rhode Island established the first public special day class for mentally retarded students in 1896; crippled children were provided a special class for the first time in Chicago in 1899, and the

---

[21]Aiello, op. cit., p. 246.

following year Chicago opened one of the first special classes for blind youngsters.[22]

The parents of these students who were now being served in the public school system were encouraged that there were classes available for their previously excluded youngsters. Educators, legislators, statesmen and other advocates for the handicapped were pleased to be able to make provision for at least some of the exceptional student population. Yet, the programs were limited in number and as a rule served only the more severely handicapped students. Those students with less obvious handicapping conditions such as mild mental retardation, epilepsy, emotional disturbance and specific learning disabilities were seldom diagnosed and virtually no public school special programs were available for these youngsters until some years later.

As a result, many of these less severely handicapped students were either excluded from public education in spite of the compulsory education laws, encouraged to leave school voluntarily or were included in the regular education program where no special help was available to them. In the twentieth century much attention was to be focused on these children and educational provisions to meet their special needs were begun.

Programs and services for the handicapped prior to the 1900's were confined mainly to individuals with severe physical and mental disorders. The blind, deaf, severely mentally retarded, severely physically disabled and severely mentally ill were so obviously incapacitated that they were difficult for society to ignore. However, as the public

---

[22]Connor, op. cit., pp. 368-69.

education system expanded to include all students within a given age range, individuals with less obvious handicaps became more apparent and the problem of how to deal with them more acute. Three of the major groups of less severely handicapped students are the mildly retarded who have limited potential and who learn at a slower than normal rate, students with chronic physical problems such as cerebral palsy and epilepsy, and learning disabled students who have average learning potential but are significantly below average in achievement.[23]

In the twentieth century, the public education system slowly began to acknowledge the existence of these youngsters and to provide for their special education needs. This was done almost exclusively through special education classes in the public school system where students were grouped according to their category of disability much as had been done for the more severely handicapped students in the previous century. By 1911, more than 100 school districts in various states had segregated special classes in regular schools operating for children with a wide variety of handicapping conditions. As the number of classes grew, the added costs of providing specialized education for students began to be subsidized by state funds. Aiello reported that in the 1920's, Pennsylvania school districts were awarded state support in the sum of $20.00 annually if they provided classes for handicapped children.[24] It was not until a decade later that the Federal government demonstrated interest in, and support for, education of the handicapped.

---

[23]Sheila Lowenbraun and James Q. Affleck, eds., Teaching Mildly Handicapped Children in Regular Classes (Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, 1976), pp. 1-13.

[24]Aiello, loc. cit.

President Herbert Hoover held the first White House Conference on Child Health and Protection in 1930.[25] This national recognition of special education for handicapped children led to the formation a few years later of the Department of Special Education within the U. S. Office of Education. Although Federal support for the concept of special education for the handicapped was evident in the 1930's, financial assistance in the form of federal aid remained minimal until the late 1950's.

The aftermath of two World Wars had a profound effect on society's view and treatment of handicapped individuals. The end of the First World War brought with it the return of thousands of previously healthy men who had become physically or mentally disabled in the course of defending their country. These heroes had previously led normal lives. Now retraining and rehabilitation to enable them once again to lead productive and independent existences became an American concern. Watching these handicapped men become functioning, contributing members of society through education and training expanded the American view of the potential of handicapped individuals more than ever before. The increased contact with these disabled persons contributed to the general public's growing belief that many handicapped individuals were definitely capable human beings. This view began to be generalized to other handicapped individuals as well. It culminated in 1920 with the passage of the Federal Civilian Rehabilitation Act. This act entitled all disabled persons, not just war veterans, to training and assistance to help them reach the goal of economic independence and full participation in

---

[25]Aiello, op. cit., pp. 247-48.

society.[26]

According to Harding, the depression slowed the growth of special education and training programs in America. Not until the 1940's was interest renewed. The aftermath of World War II brought to the attention of another generation tens of thousands of previously normal persons who returned home from the war with physical and mental and emotional handicaps. Watching these individuals adapt to their disabilities and function in society once again as useful, contributing citizens in spite of their handicaps, expanded further the public view of the potential and capabilities of handicapped individuals. Society recognized again as before what could be accomplished by a handicapped person who was given appropriate education and training. Once again renewed respect for human potential was generalized to include individuals handicapped by other causes.

Media coverage of the successes of rehabilitated war veterans, as well as direct association with them created for many other handicapped individuals and their parents a more optimistic outlook about the potential and the civil rights of individuals handicapped by other causes. Organizations for the disabled, their parents, and other supporters emerged around mid-century and have grown in number and power since that time. The work of these organizations has had substantial effect on present day laws related to the rights of the handicapped.[27]

In California, the growth of special education schools and

---

[26]Ibid.

[27]Norris G. Harding, ed., Behavior of Exceptional Children (2d. ed., Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, 1978), pp. 9-10.

public special education classes for the handicapped mirrored that of the nation as a whole. In 1860, two residential facilities, The California School for the Deaf and The California School for the Blind were founded in San Francisco. Both schools provided residential and day schooling for students living any where in the state who qualified for entrance. In 1921, the California Legislature appropriated additional money to local school districts which established special classes in the public schools for blind, deaf and mentally retarded students. The number and types of special classes increased over the next eight years with the depression contributing to the curtailment of further expansion until after World War II.

In 1947, California lawmakers earmarked new monies and passed new legislation to monitor and evaluate existing programs for the handicapped. This development was one part of a nationwide movement to examine the efficacy of special education classes. The controversy and investigation centered particularly around special classes for the mildly retarded, designated in California as Educable Mentally Retarded (EMR) students. As interest grew, so did research studies comparing the progress of EMR students in special classes with those educated in regular classes. The results of several studies as well as the growing moral and legal questions about segregating certain students from others for their education, led to a number of court cases and legislative mandates which were to change significantly the appearance and the focus of special education for handicapped students.[28]

---

[28]Larry P. v. Wilson Riles, United States District Court of the Northern District of California, Opinion (October, 1979), pp. 1-131.

The Dilemma of Special Class Versus Regular Class for the Mildly Handicapped

Prior to the 1950's, little effort had been made anywhere in the nation to research the effectiveness of special segregated classes for the handicapped. Bennett in 1932 and Pertsch in 1936 published studies dealing with mildly retarded elementary students. Both investigators found that the students in special classes performed no better academically than similarly handicapped students who were working in regular classes without special help. Bennett and Pertsch's studies were severely criticized for their research design and methodology, and neither influenced the thinking of educators about special class placement for mildly retarded students at the time of their publication.[29] However, both studies foreshadowed the controversy over special class or regular class placement which began late in the 1940's and increased in intensity during the 1950's, 1960's and early 1970's.

A comprehensive article by Hartman and Hartman in 1976 reviewed and summarized the early arguments for and against special classes. They reported that those who favored special class placement for handicapped students gave the following reasons for their position: (1) special classes are more homogeneous since only students with the same disability are in the same class, (2) special classes are smaller, therefore, students get more individual attention, (3) handicapped students in special classes are sheltered from competition with non-handicapped students, (4) special class teachers know well the learning

---

[29]Jeffery J. Zettel and Joseph Ballard, "The Education of All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, PL 94-142: It's History, Origins and Concepts," Journal of Education, 161 (Summer, 1979), 13-14.

and social needs of their students because students often remain with the same teacher for several years, (5) special class teachers have specialized training to meet the needs of their exceptional students, and (6) there are special education supervisors who make periodic visits to help the special class teachers with any questions and concerns they might have.[30] The authors reported that those individuals who oppose special class placement for handicapped youngsters marshalled the following arguments: (1) there is less motivation and lower expectations for handicapped students in special classes, (2) there is no modeling of appropriate behaviors in special classes since non-handicapped students are excluded from them, (3) having the same teacher year after year can result in a limited curriculum and the lack of fresh insight and approach, (4) the range of abilities and needs is often as great in a categorical special class as it is in a regular class, and (5) special supervision and support help is generally minimal and often of questionable value.[31]

The dilemma of special or regular class placement for mildly retarded and other less severely handicapped students grew as educators began looking at the findings of numerous well-controlled research studies of the 1950's, 1960's and early 1970's. These studies most often involved mildly retarded students. There were some conflicting results reported, but generally it was suggested that the academic gains of mildly handicapped students in special classes were no more and often

---

[30]Robert K. Hartman and Joyce A. Hartman, "The Two-Directional Resource Room: Report on a Pilot Project," Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, 11 (December, 1976), 296.

[31]Ibid., p. 297.

were less than those made by mildly retarded students in regular education classes.[32]

There were fewer clearcut results in the non-academic areas of personal, social and emotional growth. Some studies reported that retarded students in special classes demonstrated more growth in those areas than similar students in regular classes. However, other studies suggested that retarded students in regular classes mixed more with their non-retarded peers than did similar students in special classes.[33] Johnson reviewed the research evidence on academic and non-academic growth for mildly handicapped students and concluded the following:

> If the special class groups have any advantage over the regular class groups, it appears to be slight and probably not particularly meaningful. This latter finding comes despite the overwhelming evidence of lack of peer acceptance of the mentally handicapped in the regular classroom. The only area in which the special class has demonstrated superiority of any significance is in peer acceptance.[34]

A 1976 update of research into academic and non-academic achievement of the mildly retarded was done by Hartman and Hartman and concurred with Johnson's appraisal of academic achievement. However, more evidence of peer acceptance by non-handicapped students in regular classes was reported in studies conducted after Johnson's review of research done fourteen years earlier.[35]

Concern about the acceptance of handicapped individuals by the

---

[32]Ibid., p. 298.

[33]Donald L. MacMillan, Mental Retardation in School and Society (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1977), pp. 430-433.

[34]G. Orville Johnson, "Special Education for the Mentally Handicapped--A Paradox," Exceptional Children, 29 (September, 1962), 66.

[35]Hartman and Hartman, op. cit., p. 298.

non-handicapped and about the interaction between groups in the school setting and beyond has been a major concern of many educators, parents and legislators. Johnson and Kirk reported that segregation of the handicapped was as much a state of mind as a physical reality, and that disbanding special classes in favor of regular class placement alone was not an appropriate answer. They believed that changing the attitudes of the non-handicapped population as well as changing behaviors of the handicapped were worthwhile and necessary goals if both groups were to be able to live and work together in society.[36]

Another dimension of the "special class versus regular class" dilemma for mildly handicapped students was highlighted in 1968 by Lloyd Dunn's classic report, "Special Education for the Mildly Retarded--Is Much of it Justified?"[37] and a report entitled "The Six Hour Retarded Child"[38] put together in 1970 by the President's Committee on Mental Retardation. The theme of both presentations was that a significant number of students in special classes for the mildly retarded had been incorrectly labeled and inappropriately placed. While the original intent of a special class was to provide for a homogeneous group of students with the same handicapping condition, more and more evidence was being amassed which indicated that such was not the actual case. For a variety of reasons which included imprecise assessment instruments,

---

[36]G. Orville Johnson and Samuel Kirk "Are Mentally Handicapped Children Segregated in the Regular Grades?" Exceptional Children, 17 (June, 1950), 65-8 and 87-8.

[37]Lloyd H. Dunn, "Special Education for the Mildly Retarded--Is Much of it Justified?" Exceptional Children, 35 (May, 1968), 5-22.

[38]James M. Kauffman and James S. Payne, Mental Retardation (Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, 1975), pp. 29-30.

incorrect interpretation of problems, the inability of public education to cope with racially and culturally diverse students, and the shortage of money for alternative programs, special education classes of the 1960's became a dumping ground for a significant number of students whose only major handicap was failing to function appropriately in the regular education program.[39] By the early 1970's it was obvious that what Maynard Reynolds[40] referred to as the "two box theory of education" --"normal" children in one setting and "handicapped" children in another--was not working. Many researchers recognized the need for and potential benefit of a compromise educational setting which provided dual placement in regular and special education programs.

As early as 1946, Shattuck recognized that extremists on both sides of the "special class versus regular class" controversy were polarizing the problem to the detriment of the students involved. Because "the handicapped need special understanding rather than special classes,"[41] Shattuck suggested that students be able to spend a portion of their time in both regular and special classes, and that the decision of how to distribute the time be based on each individual child's needs.

A few years later the courts began looking at segregated education on racial grounds and ruled in the 1954 Brown decision that segregation based on racial or ethnic background was a violation of an

---

[39]Marilyn C. Kameen, "Creating Least Restrictive Environments for Handicapped Children," Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 13 (February, 1979), 150-228.

[40]Maynard C. Reynolds, "Education of Handicapped Students: Some Areas of Confusion," Phi Delta Kappan, 61 (May, 1980), 603.

[41]Marquis Shattuck, "Segregation versus Non-Segregation of Exceptional Children," Exceptional Children, 12 (January, 1946), 237.

individual's basic civil rights.[42] Later cases involved segregation, exclusion and denial of "equal access" for special needs younsters. These cases established the principles that no handicapped student could be denied an education at public expense, in the most normal educational setting appropriate and that a meaningful opportunity to participate in the educational program must be available to all students regardless of their special needs.[43]

Over the years many individual states had passed a variety of laws providing public education for certain categories of handicapped students. By 1975, only two states had no such statutory provisions as part of their educational law.[44] However, state provisions varied greatly in their intent and scope, so a movement was begun to establish a basic, uniform educational opportunity guarantee for all handicapped youngsters through Federal legislation. This movement culminated in 1975 with the signing of Public Law 94-142, The Education for All Handicapped Children Act.

One major provision of this comprehensive law established that handicapped children were to be educated in what was termed the "least restrictive environment" appropriate for each child's special needs. To meet this provision, every state was directed to establish a continuum of educational placements and range of educational services for

---

[42]Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U. S. 483, 493 (1954).

[43]Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children v. Pennsylvania, 343 F. Supp. 279 (E.D. Pa., 1972); Mills v. D. C. Board of Education, 348 F. Supp. 866 (D.C., 1972); Lau v. Nichols 414 U.S. 563, 94 S. Ct. 786 39 L.Ed, 2d 1 (Cal., 1974).

[44]Jeffery J. Zettel and Joseph Ballard, "The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, PL 94-142: Its History, Origins, and Concepts," Journal of Education, 161 (Summer, 1979), 10.

handicapped youngsters. No longer could the options be exclusively either special class or regular class. Instead, several middle positions which included dual enrollment in regular and special education programs were to be made available for the handicapped students who could profit from them.

The term "mainstreaming" has often been used interchangeably with the "least restrictive environment," yet in reality the two terms are not synonymous.[45] "Mainstreaming" is an educational placement option suitable only for some handicapped students. The term generally implies inclusion of an exceptional youngster in the regular education program for all or part of the school day. The "least restrictive environment" is a philosophical concept which is applied to all handicapped individuals. The concept's premise is that a handicapped individual should be removed no farther from the mainstream of education or of society than is appropriate for his or her special needs. For many mildly handicapped students mainstreaming may be the least restrictive educational environment. However, for many severely handicapped persons, the appropriate least restrictive environment may be an institutional setting.

The concept of providing for contact between handicapped and non-handicapped individuals through mainstreaming is not a new one. During the 1920's Grasser proposed a plan to incorporate deaf students into the regular education program after they had spent two years in a special facility for the deaf. As early as 1851, Samuel Gridley Howe,

---

[45]Joseph Roberts and Bonnie Hawk, Legal Rights Primer for the Handicapped (Novato: Academic Therapy, 1980), p. 28.

when discussing the needs of blind students at the Perkins Institute, observed that it was "most desirable that they should associate with the seeing."[46] Finally, Kameen dates the first large scale mainstreaming efforts from the late 1800's when the effort was made to take handicapped students from isolated, residential and day facilities and to put them into special classes in the public school system.[47]

Johnson and Kirk expressed concern about the ill effects which resulted for the handicapped student from the lack of contact with the non-handicapped when they wrote:

> Since a human being is a product of his culture and his reactions to that culture, segregation for any length of time in a restricted environment would tend to handicap him more than if he had not been placed in the isolated situation.[48]

Schulz later expressed the dual benefits of mainstreaming when she reported the following:

> One of the greatest advantages to mainstreaming is that handicapped and non-handicapped children are required to deal realistically with personal and inter-personal problems. Solving the problems may not be easy or pleasant, but it is typical of the life they will share after their school years.[49]

Klein identified five principles which express the current view of handicapped individuals and which underlie the concept of mainstreaming. While Klein specifically discussed these principles as they related to

---

[46]Frances P. Connor, "The Past is Prologue: Teacher Preparation in Special Education," Exceptional Children, 42 (April, 1976), 368.

[47]Kameen, op. cit., p. 150.

[48]G. Orville Johnson and Samuel Kirk, "Are Mentally Handicapped Children Segregated in the Regular Grades?" Exceptional Children, 17 (June, 1950), 65.

[49]Jane B. Schulz, "Facing the Label," Education Unlimited, 1 (October, 1979), 51.

pre-school children, they have been voiced in relation to older students as well, and they appear to reflect much of society's thinking today about handicapped individuals. Klein's five principles are (1) a handicapped child is a child first and has the same basic needs as a non-handicapped child, (2) handicapping conditions are complex and involve the whole child not just the afflicted portion, (3) handicapped children are not a homogeneous group--even those with the same handicapping condition, (4) a handicap may always remain and each child must learn to cope with it, and (5) handicapped children, like all others, are entitled to an equal opportunity to learn and develop to the maximum of their potential.[50]

There are many effective ways to implement and facilitate mainstreaming. Each state has been free to develop a plan to do so within the guidelines of PL 94-142. Most states have adopted some type of special education resource room program which allows many mildly handicapped youngsters to spend part of their school day in regular education classes and part of it in a resource room. The services offered to students and to classroom teachers by the resource room teacher are dependent upon the type of resource room program in operation. The following section presents an examination of the general development, philosophy and concerns about special education resource rooms. Also presented is the general development of the special education resource teacher role.

---

[50]Jennie Klein, "Teaching the Special Child in Regular Classrooms," Yearbook of Special Education, 4 (1978-79), 145-51.

National Special Education Resource Room Models

The basic special education resource room model provides for dual enrollment of handicapped youngsters in regular and special education programs. Each student is scheduled into a regular classroom and into the resource room for the time, curriculum and services appropriate to his or her special needs. The specific services offered to students and others vary according to the particular type of resource room model in operation. These will be discussed in a later section as they pertain to the development of California's Resource Specialist role.

The impetus for selecting the resource room model as a major mainstreaming vehicle for mildly handicapped youngsters came from many sources. Court decisions and legislative mandates related to individual rights, desegregation and equal educational opportunity, were applied to many groups, including the handicapped. The concept of "normalization" and the return of many handicapped individuals from state institutions and hospitals to community facilities reflected the least restrictive environment philosophy applied outside of the educational setting.[51] Results of studies which demonstrated that association with "normal" peers is beneficial to both handicapped and non-handicapped,[52] and other studies which pointed out that many categorized and labeled students act in accordance with their label,[53] whether good or bad, all contributed

---

[51]Roberts and Hawk, op. cit., pp. 55-58.

[52]S. Kenneth Thurman and Michael Lewis, "Children's Response to Differences: Some Possible Implications for Mainstreaming," Exceptional Children, 45 (March, 1979), 468-70; Barbara Hendrickson, "Teachers Make Mainstreaming Work," Learning, 7 (October, 1978), 104-120.

[53]James Foley, "The Effects of Labeling and Teacher Behavior on Children's Attitudes," American Journal of Mental Deficiency,

to growth of the special education resource room as a viable educational alternative for many handicapped youngsters.

During the 1960's and 70's, society focused on the essential commonality of individuals while at the same time accepting and even celebrating the differences between them. Humanistic education and concern for developing the "whole" person gained strength during this time.[54] The term "individual differences" and "human potential" became a familiar part of the educational and philosophical literature. Concurrent with this thinking was the development of a new special education field called "learning disabilities." This field gained strength in the 1960's, national acceptance in the 1970's, and in many ways influenced the development of the special education resource room model and the role of the resource room teacher.

Lerner reported that in 1963 Samuel Kirk was one of the first writers to use the collective term "learning disabilities."[55] Youngsters with learning disabilities are those whose actual academic, personal or social development is far below their potential with no explainable cause such as mental retardation, emotional disturbance or a sensory handicap. The unique term "learning disabilities" includes an aggregate of learning disorders and behavioral manifestations while avoiding

---

83 (January, 1979), 380-84; Bob Algozzine, Cecil Mercer and Terry Countermine, "The Effects of Labels and Behavior on Teacher Expectations," Exceptional Children, 44 (October, 1977), 131-32.

[54]Robert E. Valett, Humanistic Education (St. Louis: C. V. Mosby, 1977); Bob Samples, The Metaphoric Mind (Reading: Addison-Wesley, 1976).

[55]Janet W. Lerner, Children With Learning Disabilities (2d. ed., Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1976), p. 23.

assumption of any etiological factors. McCarthy and McCarthy pointed out the advantage of the term when they wrote that it "describes the child's school behavior rather than assigning its cause."[56] The emphasis on a descriptive term based on observable behavior in the classroom did much to encourage educators to use the same technique with other handicapped students. Soon other educators and writers were behaviorally defining characteristics of students as they functioned in the educational setting rather than using only medical or etiological labels which gave little, if any, insight into the student's educational needs.[57] As a result, students who previously were grouped together educationally simply because they shared the same handicapping condition were being looked at as individuals with unique strengths, weaknesses and needs. It became apparent from this new perspective that not all students with a given handicap such as mental retardation have the same educational potential or problems.

Focusing on the individual student rather than the handicapping condition led many educators to see that there were better ways to group students for instruction. It was this focusing on how a student performed in school and what was needed to enhance that performance which led to the "cross-categorical" approach that characterizes many present day special education resource room programs across the country.[58]

---

[56]James J. McCarthy and Joan F. McCarthy, Learning Disabilities (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1969), p. xii.

[57]Bill R. Gearheart, Teaching the Learning Disabled (St. Louis: C. V. Mosby, 1976), pp. 3-9; Gerald Wallace and James M. Kauffman, Teaching Children with Learning Problems (2d. ed.; Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, 1978), pp. 3-13.

[58]Jane B. Schulz, "Facing the Label," Education Unlimited, 1 (October, 1979), 50.

These programs are available to youngsters, regardless of their category of handicap, who can benefit from and function for part of their school day in the regular classroom with their non-handicapped peers. It may take specially designed furniture for a wheelchair-bound student, large print materials for a visually impaired student or a unique approach to reading for a student with learning disabilities, but youngsters such as these are often assigned to a resource room and a regular classroom because this is the least restrictive environment which meets their social and academic needs. Along with special equipment and materials, regular class teachers are often able to consult with the special education resource room teacher about strategies, needs and concerns related to mainstreamed students.

Although the resource room has become the primary delivery system to integrate mildly handicapped children into the educational mainstream, there are many variations of the resource room model, and some educators have expressed concerns about both the concept and the practice of resource room programming.[59] One major area of concern is the same as was expressed with regard to the rapid growth of segregated special education classes in the public school during the nineteenth century. It is that there exists a definite lack of sound, observational data demonstrating the effectiveness of resource room programs.[60] Brandt, in 1975, discussed the inevitable time lag between any

---

[59]Bruno J. D'Alonzo, Rosemarie L. D'Alonzo and August J. Mauser, "Developing Resource Rooms for the Handicapped," Teaching Exceptional Children, 11 (Spring, 1979), 91-96.

[60]Paul T. Sindlar and Stanley L. Deno, "The Effectiveness of Resource Programming," Journal of Special Education, 12 (Spring, 1978), 17-28.

innovative program and the observable evidence to document its efficacy.[61] Sargent reiterated Brandt's concern and focused it particularly on resource room programs when he pointed out the following: "Administrative descriptions of resource teacher models represent conceptualizations of program operations rather than descriptions of programs in actual operation."[62] Sindlar and Deno agreed with both Brandt and Sargent and made a strong plea for more studies which document and verify the actual operations and workings of resource room programs for handicapped students.[63] These authors all seem to be suggesting that a close look at what actually occurs in a resource room program is of major significance to the field. Jones, et al., in an extensive study of the theoretical and practical issues involved in evaluating mainstreaming programs, suggested a number of ways to improve evaluation design and presented a set of guidelines for developing and appraising mainstreaming evaluation reports in accordance with the mandates of PL 94-142. The authors concluded their discussion by saying that, ". . . it will become possible to use evaluative procedures to improve instructional practices and, in time, to know the effectiveness of mainstreaming efforts."[64]

A second major concern about resource room programs for

---

[61]Laurence Sargent, "Resource Teacher Time Utilization: An Observational Study," Exceptional Children, 47 (March, 1981), 421, citing R. Brandt, Studying Behavior in Natural Settings (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972).

[62]Ibid., pp. 420-21.

[63]Sindlar and Deno, op. cit., p. 28.

[64]Reginald L. Jones, et al., "Evaluating Mainstreaming Programs: Models, Caveats, Considerations and Guidelines," Exceptional Children, 44 (May, 1978), 600.

handicapped youngsters deals with the attitudes and behaviors toward the handicapped of those individuals who make up the educational mainstream. "Mainstreaming is intended to maximize interactions of handicapped and non-handicapped students" as preparation for living and working together in society.[65] It is intended to be a positive experience which teaches the handicapped and non-handicapped to understand and accept one another as individuals. However, this cannot be expected to come about automatically. Miltenberger cautioned mainstreaming advocates that attitudinal barriers on the part of regular teachers, administrators, non-handicapped students, and society as a whole would not disappear simply because handicapped students were physically integrated into regular classes.[66] In an extensive article which dealt with attitudes toward handicapped individuals, Cohen cited the following statement made by Wallace in 1974:

> Before our handicapped children can enter the mainstream we try to prepare them in every way possible. But, we must also prepare the mainstream itself, lest our handicapped children be mistreated and come to harm in it.[67]

Cohen went on to observe that, ". . . very little attention has been given to the question of how to develop receptivity in the mainstream toward the handicapped children who are or will shortly be entering it."[68]

---

[65]Lloyd Garrison, "Are You Ready for Mainstreaming?" Business Education Forum, 32 (January, 1978), 9.

[66]Jerry Miltenberger, "Mainstreaming--A Different Approach," Education Unlimited, 1 (October, 1979), 51.

[67]Shirley Cohen, "Improving Attitudes Toward the Handicapped," Educational Forum, 42, (November, 1977), citing S. Wallace, Statement read before the New York State Senate Select Committee on Mental and Physical Handicaps, New York City, November 21, 1974.

[68]Ibid.

Other researchers investigated the consequences of failing to prepare classroom teachers adequately for mainstreaming. Moore and Fine reported that "mainstreaming initiated with unprepared or unaccepting teachers will reduce the chances of successful integration of the child, and the exceptional child involved will be the loser."[69] Roubinek concurred when he stated:

> Significant positive educational change is not made in the halls of Congress, in the state capitol, or in the superintendent's office. Without the support of the classroom teacher, any significant change is doomed where it counts the most, in the classroom with the target children.[70]

Cheyney and Strichart cautioned educators not to view the resource room as a special education panacea. These researchers indicated that handicapped students with dual placement in special and regular programs are subjected to a variety of teaching techniques, management systems, curriculum organizations and human personalities which sometimes create more problems for the mainstreamed student than they solve.[71] The resource teacher is in a unique position to help prepare both handicapped youngsters and classroom teachers for mainstreaming. Many resource room models and resource teacher roles do include consultation with and in-service of regular educators.

Although a number of researchers expressed concerns about resource room programming, none suggested eliminating the resource room

---

[69]Judy Moore and Marvin Fine, "Regular and Special Class Teachers' Perceptions of Normal and Exceptional Children and Their Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming," Psychology in the Schools, 15 (April, 1978), 259.

[70]Darrell Roubinek, "Will Mainstreaming Fit?" Educational Leadership, 35 (February, 1978), 414.

[71]Wendy Cheyney and Stephen S. Strichart, "A Learning Station Model for the Resource Room," Academic Therapy, 16 (January, 1981), 272.

as an educational alternative. Ito conducted a follow-up study with learning disabled students who no longer attended a resource room. He discovered that the student gains made while in the program were sustained after they were mainstreamed 100 percent of the time and concluded that "few students failed to benefit from resource room intervention."[72]

Those writers who enumerated the positive aspects of resource room programs included Johnson who pointed out the benefits of stimulation and modeling by non-handicapped peers, the presentation of more academic subject matter and the expectation of greater academic growth.[73] Sargent reported the possibility of less stigma attached to students assigned part time to regular classes and better acceptance by parents of resource room placement rather than the more isolated placement of a special education class.[74] Lerner[75] and Montgomery[76] discussed the multiplier or "ripple effect" that the resource teacher has when helping classroom teachers and others to deal effectively with mainstreamed handicapped youngsters. Trained classroom teachers can, over the years, help more students than can one resource teacher working directly with a

---

[72]H. Richard Ito, "After the Resource Room--Then What?" Academic Therapy, 16 (January, 1981), 286.

[73]G. Orville Johnson, "Special Education for the Mentally Handicapped--A Paradox," Exceptional Children, 29 (September, 1962), 67.

[74]Laurence R. Sargent, "Resource Teacher Time Utilization: An Observational Study," Exceptional Children, 47 (March, 1981), 420-21.

[75]Janet W. Lerner, Children with Learning Disabilities (2d ed., Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1976), pp. 370-71 and 375-76.

[76]Mark Montgomery, "The Special Educator as Consultant: Some Strategies," Teaching Exceptional Children, 10 (Summer, 1978), 111.

group of students from year to year. Lerner also pointed out that a resource room program can serve a larger number of students than can be served in a special class.[77] Wiederholt made the same point and went on to conclude, therefore, that resource room programs are less expensive to operate on a per pupil basis than are special day classes.[78] In a comprehensive review of resource room programs, D'Alonzo, D'Alonzo and Mauser made the observation that there is no one best program for all handicapped children and that educators must always be "pupil advocates and not program advocates."[79] This sentiment was expressed as far back as 1946 when Shattuck reported that "the purpose of education is to develop the child's own all-round social, emotional, cultural, academic and vocational development using the best environment for this purpose."[80]

The success of any resource room program is heavily dependent upon the special education teacher who operates the program and provides the services. The special education resource teacher role, in general, is a composite of old tasks previously carried out by others and of new tasks which reflect more recent needs and research. An examination of the development of the resource teacher role in general will establish a background for the final section of this chapter which

---

[77]Lerner, op. cit., p. 375.

[78]Lee J. Wiederholt, "Planning Resource Rooms for the Mildly Handicapped," Focus on Exceptional Children, 10 (January, 1974), 6.

[79]Bruno J. D'Alonzo, Rosemarie L. D'Alonzo and August J. Mauser, "Developing Resource Rooms for the Handicapped," Teaching Exceptional Children, 11 (Spring, 1979), 92.

[80]Marquis Shattuck, "Segregation vs Non-Segregation of Exceptional Children," Exceptional Children, 12 (1946), 238.

explores the specific development of California's Resource Specialist role.

Resource teachers in music, art and other areas of the curriculum have been utilized in the public schools for many years. They were often called consultants or specialists and they generally traveled from class to class and often from school to school to enrich the basic education program for all students. Sawyer and Wilson reported that the remedial reading teacher of the 1920's was actually the first educational specialist to focus on low or non-achieving readers and to work with them outside of the regular classroom setting as does the modern resource room teacher.[81]

The development in the 1960's of the special education field of learning disabilities gave rise to a new educational specialist, the learning disabilities teacher. This specialist dealt with a group of handicapped students who had an array of academic, personal and interpersonal problems and who were generally assigned to spend part of their school day in the regular classroom. Because of this dual enrollment in regular and special education, learning disabilities teachers often found themselves helping the classroom teacher understand and cope with difficult student behavior and learning problems. Lerner,[82] in an extensive investigation of the similarities and differences between remedial reading and learning disabilities teachers, concluded that the

---

[81]Walter E. Sawyer and Bonnie A. Wilson, "Role Clarification for Remedial Reading and Learning Disabilities Teachers," The Reading Teacher, 33 (November, 1979), 162-66.

[82]Janet W. Lerner, "Symposium No. 11--Remedial Reading and Learning Disabilities: Are They the Same or Different?" Journal of Special Education, 9 (Summer, 1975), 117-81.

two specialists often had overlapping functions and student populations.

While the remedial reading and learning disabilities teachers appear to be antecedents of the special education resource teacher, other functions often ascribed to that role were previously carried out by social workers, school counselors and school psychologists. Johnson and Kirk noted that during the 1940's schools often employed social workers whose role it was to communicate with, educate and counsel parents of students whose school problems were linked with home.[83] There is much emphasis on working with and giving assistance to parents of the handicapped in Federal law. Since few present day schools systems have social workers on staff, and, since most classroom teachers look to support personnel for help in these areas, the resource teacher role often includes parent education, counseling and communication responsibilities.

Kameen suggested that elementary school counselors should become more involved in the "counseling, consulting and coordinating function" necessary to make mainstreaming effective.[84] Yet she acknowledged that in actuality contact between elementary school counselors and handicapped children has been very limited and was frequently left up to "other specialized personnel."[85] In fact, there are few counselors at the elementary school level and so the tasks of consulting and

---

[83]G. Orville Johnson and Samuel Kirk, "Are Mentally Handicapped Children Being Segregated in the Regular Grades?" Exceptional Children, 17 (June, 1950), 87.

[84]Marilyn C. Kameen, "Creating Least Restrictive Environments for Handicapped Children," Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 13 (February, 1979), 151.

[85]Ibid., p. 150.

coordinating are generally included as part of the resource teacher role.

Finally, Gibbons acknowledged that although school psychologists are trained in consultation skills, it is the resource teacher who does most of the consulting with classroom teachers, mainstreamed students and parents.[86] This situation has evolved because the teacher is generally in the schools more often than are psychologists and, therefore, can offer needed services at crisis times and also on a continuous basis.

As can be seen, the special education resource teacher role is a multi-faceted one made up of many tasks previously carried out by other educators. The role, however, does not stop there. Legislated mandates and research into successful special education resource room programs have added new tasks and redefined old ones. California, like the other forty-nine states, has been given the latitude to develop the special education resource teacher role within the guidelines of Federal law and regulation. Today in California the special education resource teacher is called a Resource Specialist. The Resource Specialist role developed from a previous resource room teacher role and has been updated and redefined by state law and regulations. An examination of the current legal stipulations for the role and a report of the literature which has influenced the role are presented in the following section after a brief description of mainstreaming in California has been presented as a framework.

---

[86]Spenser Gibbons, "PL 94-142: An Impetus for Consultation," The School Psychology Digest, 7 (Summer, 1978), 20.

California's Resource Specialist Role

Before looking at the Resource Specialist role as outlined in law, regulation, literature and in the Resource Specialist Role Survey developed for this study, a brief background of past mainstreaming efforts in California is presented.

Mainstreaming in California

California began mainstreaming handicapped students in the 1960's, several years prior to the passage of PL 94-142. Guerin and Scatlocky[87] researched the four most common resource room mainstreaming programs used in California prior to 1975. They concluded that the Resource Specialist Program is based on the state's old learning disabilities group (LDG) model, and that the Resource Specialist role developed from that of the learning disabilities teacher.

With the LDG model, categorical funding was available to districts for students identified as educationally handicapped. Most of these youngsters had specific learning disabilities and/or behavioral problems which caused them academic difficulties. The LDG teacher operated a "pull out" program. LDG students were scheduled for specific time periods out of their regular classroom and into the LDG room for academic assessment and remediation. In the early LDG programs consultation was minimal, for an LDG teacher needed to work with thirty-two identified students daily in order that the district receive full state funding for the program.

---

[87]Gilbert R. Guerin and Kathleen Scatlocky, "Integration Programs for the Mildly Handicapped," Exceptional Children, 41 (November, 1974), 173-79.

The California Master Plan for Special Education, as passed in 1975, expanded the LDG model, renaming it the Resource Specialist Program. This new mainstreaming program was a cross-categorical one which provided a Resource Specialist teacher and an aide to assist students having a wider range of learning, behavioral and physical handicaps. By law, identified handicapped students who could be appropriately placed for the majority of the school day in regular classes could become candidates for the Resource Specialist Program. At this point, consultation became an important component of the Resource Specialist Program along with those already established components of assessment and instruction carried over from the old LDG model.

The Master Plan for Special Education provided for pilot Resource Specialist Programs to be funded and operated in selected regions throughout the state. Beginning in 1975 with the funding of six Master Plan Regions, the gradual implementation of the Master Plan continued until the summer of 1980, when there were twenty-one Master Plan Regions operating in California. Between 1975 and 1980, most non-Master Plan Regions were funded in the traditional fashion and continued to mainstream students according to the LDG model.

The passage of SB 1870 in July, 1980, stopped the gradual implementation of the Master Plan and gave a deadline of September, 1982, for all school districts to be in full compliance with all Master Plan provisions. Since the passage of SB 1870, additional legislation and regulations have attempted to define and clarify the scope of the Resource Specialist Program and the role of the Resource Specialist. In sections of both the California Education Code and the Title 5 Regulations attempts were made to provide a legal framework for the Resource

Specialist role. Local agencies must develop their specific job descriptions based on these legal guidelines. However, that is not easily done for there is a lack of clarity in the Education Code as well as omissions and overlap in the extensive list of competencies for Resource Specialists outlined in state regulations.

In the California Education Code there is no direct statement of the Resource Specialist role. Instead it is specified in the Code what the Resource Specialist Program is to provide. The assumption is generally made that it is the Resource Specialist who is to do the enumerated tasks since the program is under his or her direction. In reality, however, the tasks are extremely broad and are often carried out by others in addition to or in place of the Resource Specialist. The California Education Code states that the Resource Specialist Program will provide the following; (1) direct instruction and services to identified handicapped students, (2) information and assistance to the handicapped and their parents, (3) consultation, resource information and materials to parents and the regular education staff, (4) coordination of regular and special education services, (5) regular monitoring of pupil progress and the IEP process, and (6) emphasis on academic achievement and, for secondary students, career and vocational development and preparation for adult life.[88]

California's Title 5 Regulations include thirty-one Resource Specialist Credential Competencies developed by the Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing. These competencies are grouped under

---

[88]California Education Code, Part 30, Special Education Programs, Section 56362 (a) (1)-(6).

six functional headings which include: (1) Consultation, (2) Coordination, (3) Functions Related to the Implementation of Laws, Regulations and Other Compliance Requirements, (4) Staff Development and Inservice Education, (5) Skills Related to Parent Education and, (6) Direct Instruction.[89] The development of these legal parameters for the Resource Specialist role correlates with reported research of successful special education resource room models.

Basically the Resource Specialist role currently implied and expressed in California law and state certification regulations is a composite of the two most common types of resource teacher roles discussed in the literature. The roles developed early and were necessary to meet the requirements of two distinctly different resource room models. Sabatino, in an in-depth review of early resource room programs, classified them as the "diagnostic-tutorial model" and the "methods-materials teacher-consultant model."[90]

The "diagnostic-tutorial model" featured a teacher whose major focus was to give direct assistance to the handicapped students assigned to the resource room. The tasks which made up this role included educational assessment, diagnosis and the selection of relevent, appropriate materials for each student. It was the resource teacher who used these materials in the resource room as she/he worked directly with the students much as did the teacher is segregated special education classes. When students from the diagnostic-tutorial resource room were

---

[89]California Administrative Code, Title 5 Regulations, Section 80080.8 (a)-(f).

[90]David Sabatino, "Resource Rooms: The Renaissance in Special Education," The Journal of Special Education, 6 (May, 1972), 335-47.

in the mainstream, classroom teachers worked with them essentially without help from the resource room teacher.

The "methods-materials teacher-consultant model" emphasized communication and interpersonal skills, since this resource teacher worked more with regular class teachers than directly with handicapped students. In this model, classroom teachers received materials, suggestions, ideas and consultation from the resource teacher whose main role was to help the handicapped youngster succeed in the regular classroom while being taught by the regular classroom teacher.

Montgomery criticized the "direct services approach" described by Sabatino as time consuming and expensive. He stressed the need for and benefits of the "indirect services approach" which emphasized consultation and collaboration role components and corresponded more closely to the second model which Sabatino identified. Montgomery stated: "While the effects of consultation may not be as measurable as, say, tutoring a dozen kids in reading, the 'ripple effect' makes it a more effective proposition in the long run."[91]

In an effort to determine which of the two resource room models was most effective, Miller and Sabatino[92] conducted an extensive study using 547 students in 58 schools to measure academic gains and teacher behaviors in three educational settings. Miller and Sabatino identified one setting as the "teacher consultant model." In this model 17 itinerant special education teachers focused on improving the skills of 153

---

[91]Mark Montgomery, "The Special Educator as Consultant; Some Strategies," Teaching Exceptional Children, 10 (Summer, 1978), 111.

[92]Ted L. Miller and David A. Sabatino, "An Evaluation of the Teacher Consultant Model as an Approach to Mainstreaming," Exceptional Children, 45 (October, 1978), 86-91.

classroom teachers who worked directly with 261 mainstreamed students. The approach maximized the student's time in the regular program, reduced the labeling stigma and made the special educator a facilitator rather than an implementor of educational programs for handicapped students. In the second model, which Miller and Sabatino called the "traditional resource room," 16 resource teachers gave direct services in a resource room to 219 handicapped students who were placed in 122 regular classes for part of their school day. The third setting was a control group of 67 students who received no special education help at all.

Students in both experimental groups demonstrated greater academic improvement than the control group, but neither of the experimental models was clearly superior to the other in achieving that growth. Regular teachers with consultant help appeared to be as effective in producing increased academic achievement in students as were special educators. In the area of teacher behavior, however, significant growth was evident in classroom teachers who worked with the teacher-consultants. Behaviors such as acceptance of feelings, imparting information, praise and encouragement and positive teacher-student communication were increased significantly while criticism of students was reduced. Miller and Sabatino attributed this significant positive change in the classroom teacher behavior to the continuous informal inservice training which took place with those classroom teachers involved in the teacher-consultant model. The researchers suggested that this model was very effective and that use of it could in the long run help more children than the "traditional resource room" approach. Yet they pointed out that it was very time consuming and "must assure

both the ongoing skills development of the teacher consultant and adequate contact time with regular teachers."[93]

Other researchers who have looked at the resource teacher role have identified it as a combination of the direct service and teacher-consultation models. In 1976, Lerner discussed the learning disabilities specialist role and divided all tasks under two role headings. These she identified as (1) the Technical Role and (2) the Managerial Role.[94] The Technical Role included all direct service tasks related to student assessment and planning and implementation of the instructional program for learning disabled students. Consultation and collaboration with other professionals, paraprofessionals and parents were included as part of the Managerial Role. Lerner also included the change agent task as part of this role, defining it as developing attitudes and helping to integrate special education and regular education. Later, Vance also stressed the change agent role of the learning disabilities teacher in an article outlining the expertise and training necessary to fulfill that role.[95] Vance recommended a broad training background which included academic assessment and remediation in all curriculum areas. He also emphasized the need for inter-personal and communication skills training since the learning disabilities teacher is the "key figure in channeling services to students and teachers."[96]

---

[93]Ibid., p. 91.

[94]Janet W. Lerner, Children With Learning Disabilities (2d. ed.; Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1976), pp. 368-74.

[95]Hubert R. Vance, "Thoughts on the Learning Disabilities Teacher," Academic Therapy, 14 (January, 1979), 279-86.

[96]Ibid., p. 281.

Wiederholt, Hammil and Brown listed the three basic components of the resource teacher role as (1) assessing individual needs, (2) preparing and implementing instructional programs to meet those needs, and (3) "deliberating" with teachers about the students' needs and program.[97] For each of the three components listed, the writers presented related competencies and duties. Specific duties included in the assessment role were (1) utilizing and interpreting norm-referenced and criterion-referenced tests, (2) analytic teaching and (3) use of other assessment techniques such as observation and the structured interview. The second role component, "preparing and implementing instructional programs," included (1) knowledge of effective practices related to cognitive and affective curriculum, strategies and methodologies, and (2) giving direct instruction to students and maintaining a positive learning environment. The final area, "working with the school staff," included (1) consulting, (2) advising, (3) instructing and (4) monitoring recommendations to be carried out in the regular education program by classroom teachers.

Hawisher and Calhoun presented a resource teacher role composed of four basic functions which were (1) a diagnostician, (2) a remedial expert, (3) a consultant, and (4) an administrator.[98] While the first three functions correspond essentially to those role components discussed by others, the administrative function is a new aspect of the

---

[97]J. Lee Wiederholt, Donald D. Hammill and Virginia Brown, The Resource Teacher: A Guide to Effective Practices (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1978), p. 13.

[98]Margaret F. Hawisher and Mary L. Calhoun, The Resource Room (Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, 1978), p. 5.

role and reflects recent legal mandates related to specific time lines, accountability and due process. Hawisher and Calhoun included the following tasks as part of the administrative function: scheduling, program management, data gathering and record keeping. These tasks are designated in California as part of the Resource Specialist role, but there is no administrative function designation in state law or regulations.

Using role and competency definitions from the literature, those found in California law and regulations, existing Resource Specialist job descriptions and input from Resource Specialists about the tasks they actually perform, a comprehensive Resource Specialist Role Survey was developed for this study. The Survey included a total of nine tasks grouped under the three basic functions of (1) direct services to students, (2) collaboration/consultation and (3) management/leadership. Presentation and discussion of the tasks by functional area follows.

Direct Services to Students

Included under the function of direct services to students were the tasks of: (1) student assessment, (2) direct instruction to students, and (3) student counseling.

Cheyney and Strichart[99] presented an in-depth look at and appraisal of the difficulties a resource teacher has in providing direct services to students. They listed the problems as (1) conducting continuous, diverse and extensive multi-area assessment and instructional

---

[99]Wendy Cheyney and Stephen S. Strichart, "A Learning Stations Model for the Resource Room" Academic Therapy, 16 (January, 1981), 271-79.

planning for 24 to 28 students with heterogeneous handicaps and needs, (2) grouping students for instruction who are at different ages, grades, ability and interest levels, and (3) providing remedial curriculum in all areas at all levels in a variety of modalities and formats. Klein discussed the extensive background and knowledge necessary to do an adequate job in the area of direct services to students.[100] She listed knowledge of normal and abnormal child growth and development, handicapping conditions, etiologies, expectations, general characteristics, and the specific diagnosed and suspected strengths, weaknesses and needs of each of the two dozen or more children in a Resource Specialist Program. Vance extended the list to include knowledge of learning theory, curriculum and remedial strategies, methods and materials in the cognitive, affective and psychomotor areas.[101]

Stulac and Olive developed eleven separate direct service goals which fell within the areas of assessment, instruction and counseling.[102] Student counseling was not as frequently mentioned in the literature as assessment and instruction and it is not presently included in the thirty-one state competencies for Resource Specialists. However, several researchers have acknowledged that emotional, social, personal and interpersonal problems are evident in many handicapped students.[103]

---

[100]Jennie Klein, "Teaching the Special Child in Regular Classrooms," Yearbook of Special Education, 4 (1978-79), 145-51.

[101]Vance, op. cit., p. 280.

[102]Joseph Stulac and John Olive, Special Education Competencies for Teachers (Atlanta: Georgia State Department of Education, 1979), pp. 1-351.

[103]Hawisher and Calhoun, op. cit., pp. 102-04 and 152-54; Richard Swart, "A Secondary School Resource Room Makes Mainstreaming Work,"

The inappropriate behaviors which stem from these problems often make mainstreaming very difficult. It frequently falls to the Resource Specialist to help ameliorate these problems through classroom level counseling since school social workers, school counselors or school psychologists are often not available and, if present at all, are in the schools far less than is the Resource Specialist who generally has daily contact with students individually or in small groups.

Collaboration/Consultation

The collaboration/consultation function of the Resource Specialist Role Survey is an extension of the consultation function which has been frequently identified in the literature and is specified in the California Education Code description of the Resource Specialist Program as well as in the Resource Specialist Credential Competencies. The three tasks included under this function in the survey were (1) collaborating with parents, (2) collaborating with educators, and (3) collaborating with other individuals or agencies involved with the student. The term collaboration rather than consultation was used extensively by Downs-Taylor and Landon.[104] They observed that collaboration denoted a mutual sharing of expertise and a close working together of all individuals on an equal basis when planning and implementing a handicapped child's educational program. All too often,

---

Teaching Exceptional Children, 11 (Winter, 1979), 77-78; Steven C. Larsen, "Problem Learners: Environment Tells the Tale," Reach, 1 (November-December, 1978), 10-17.

[104]Carol Downs-Taylor and Eleanor M. Landon, Collaboration in Special Education (Belmont: Fearon Division, Pitman Learning, 1981), pp. 84-97.

according to Downs-Taylor and Landon, regular educators and parents feel that special educators are the experts with the "right answers" and often defer to them when discussing their handicapped child. Nadler, Merron and Fridel suggested that dual enrollment in regular and special programs plus the mandated involvement of parents in the cooperative planning of their handicapped child's education clearly indicate that all significant parties should "collaborate" in their shared responsibility if the handicapped child is to benefit maximally from any program or placement.[105]

Hawisher and Calhoun write of the "consultant role" but stressed the cooperative, collaborative nature of it.[106] They included working with teachers, parents, volunteers and para-professionals. Lerner extended the list of persons collaborated with to include other specialists and administrators.[107]

Hartman and Hartman in 1976 discussed a highly successful and large scale resource room program operating in Connecticut. They stressed that a major aspect of the resource teacher role was to keep in "constant communication" with teachers and parents so that all could keep a realistic, current picture of the student and his/her present needs.[108]

Reynolds, twenty years earlier had stressed mutual sharing

---

[105]Barbara Nadler, Myrna Merron and William K. Friedel, "PL 94-142: One Response to the Personnel Development Mandate," Exceptional Children, 47 (March, 1981), 463-64.

[106]Hawisher and Calhoun, op. cit., pp. 141-74.

[107]Lerner, op. cit., pp. 369-72.

[108]Hartman and Hartman, op. cit., pp. 301-2.

between resource and classroom teachers in order to provide as much support and service as possible to the exceptional child in the regular classroom environment.[109] Cheyney and Strichart added another reason for ceaseless coordination and cooperation between teachers in the two programs. They wrote that the resource teacher works "out of context of the total developmental program"[110] and must keep ever in touch to be sure all teaching is relevant to the overall program. Vance[111] spoke of the heavy "intra-professional" demands of the resource teacher role, and Klein[112] admonished resource teachers also to keep in touch with and abreast of available outside resources in order to inform parents, students and other educators.

Management/Leadership

The most recent addition to the Resource Specialist role is the management/leadership function. This amalgamation of tasks on the survey included (1) management of the Resource Specialist Program, (2) special education leadership at the school site and (3) change agent activities. The program management task is specified in California law[113] and regulations,[114] and has been included in most literature

---

[109]Maynard C. Reynolds, "A Framework for Considering Some Issues in Special Education," Exceptional Children, 28 (June, 1962), 367-70.

[110]Wendy Cheyney and Stephen S. Strichart, "A Learning Stations Model for the Resource Room," Academic Therapy, 16 (January, 1981), 272.

[111]Hubert R. Vance, "Thoughts on the Learning Disabilities Teacher," Academic Therapy, 14 (January, 1979), 281.

[112]Jennie Klein, "Teaching the Special Child in Regular Classrooms," Yearbook of Special Education, 4 (1978-79), 145-51.

[113]California Education Code, Section 56362 (a) (5).

[114]California Administrative Code, Title 5 Regulations, Section 80070.8 (b) (2) (3), (c) (2).

relating to the role of the resource teacher. Program management activities for the Resource Specialist include organizing, supervising and maintaining a quality program, and developing, implementing, monitoring and reviewing the Individualized Education Program (IEP) for each of the 24 to 28 students assigned to the Resource Specialist Program. Miller and Switzky pointed out that no two resource room programs are ever exactly the same. They vary according to remedial emphasis, materials used, teacher characteristics, physical and organizational set-up and learning environment.[115] Each of those items listed is influenced to a greater or lesser degree by the resource teacher and how she/he operates the program.

A second task of Resource Specialists in the management/leadership function is that of site special education leadership. This is a recent development in California partly based on changes in state special education law since 1980. This task included coordinating the site special education referral process, scheduling IEP meetings, monitoring time lines and legal compliance issues. There was no available literature on this recent important development in the Resource Specialist role, but it is included in state law and regulation governing Resource Specialist Programs.[116] Those Resource Specialists in the field who were interviewed about their role stressed the fact that because they are more accessible than other special educators

---

[115]Ted L. Miller and Harvey N. Switzky, "The Least Restrictive Alternative: Implications for Service Providers," Journal of Special Education, 12 (Summer, 1978), 129.

[116]California Education Code, Section 56362 (a) (3); Title 5 Regulations 80080.8 (b) (1) (2), (c) (1) (4).

(psychologists, speech clinicians, etc.) and are on site more often, site administrators and teachers expect and encourage the Resource Specialist to assume site special education leadership activities.

The final task identified as part of the management/leadership function of the Resource Specialist role is that of change agent. This task focused on promoting awareness, understanding and acceptance of handicapped individuals and conveying the philosophy, concept and practice of mainstreaming through the Resource Specialist Program model. This is done through special education inservice, staff development and parent education. Sowers reported on a four year program in North Carolina whose inservice training changed teacher attitudes in a positive way and also improved teaching competence in the basic skills and affective areas.[117] An extensive Delphi Survey of regular and special education teachers reported that emphasis on inservice training in the future is the key to successful mainstreaming.[118] Gickling, et al., also surveyed regular and special education teachers and reported that individualizing instruction and inservice training were seen as priorities for both groups if mainstreaming is to succeed.[119] Although inservice training in special education was viewed by many educators as important

---

[117]Ganelda Sowers, "Observations of a Primary School Principal After Four Years of Experience with Mainstreaming," (paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, Ontario, March, 1978).

[118]Council for Exceptional Children, "The Preparation of Special Education Personnel," Yearbook of Special Education, 4 (1978-79), 583-617.

[119]Edward E. Gickling, Lee C. Murphy and Douglas W. Mallory, "Teachers' Preferences for Resource Services," Exceptional Children, 45 (March, 1979), 442-49.

and has been done successfully in many places, such is not always the case. In a survey of rural and small city regular K-12 teachers, more than half (55.4%) said they had received no inservice training related to mainstreaming. More than 32 percent said they agreed little or not at all with the philosophy of mainstreaming, and 27 percent reported that in their classrooms mainstreaming was working very poorly or not at all.[120]

Little expressed the concern that training of resource teachers to do inservice and parent education is lacking in most institutions of higher educations.[121] Zemanek and Lehrer concurred and felt that it is necessary to "sensitize colleagues involved in teacher training to the current and future needs related to inservice training."[122]

Gickling, et al., in a discussion of inservice training, pointed out that much is done informally in the context of consultation. The research team reported:

> As important as group inservice training is, however, it should also be stressed that one to one interaction between resource teachers and regular teachers concerning a child can be one of the most effective and rewarding forms of continuous inservice training.[123]

But, as Miller and Sabatino pointed out, such one-to-one continuous

---

[120]Ravic P. Ringlaben and Jay R. Price, "Regular Class Teachers' Perceptions of Mainstreaming Effects," Exceptional Children, 47 (January, 1981), 302-04.

[121]Thomas Little, "Training Special Education Support Personnel," Teacher Educator, 13 (Autumn, 1977), 23-27.

[122]Donald H. Zemanek and Barry E. Lehrer, "The Role of University Departments of Special Education in Mainstreaming," Exceptional Children, 43 (March, 1977), 377-79.

[123]Gickling, Murphy and Mallory, op. cit., p. 448.

contact can be incredibly time consuming and, therefore, very costly.[124]

Although the Resource Specialist Role Survey developed for this study incorporated all important elements of the Resource Specialist role into nine tasks, the role itself is still obviously an awesome one. Miltenberger summed up the feelings of many when he stated:

> Having read a job description of this recent phenomenon, The Resource Specialist, I am most curious and anxious to find one. I suspect they would look similar to Superman and Wonder Woman, capable of anything and everything, as the description of their employment responsibilities precludes anyone else.[125]

Summary

Society's view of the potential, capabilities and worth of handicapped individuals has changed greatly since the beginning of recorded history. Early treatment was characterized by exploitation, ridicule and extermination. The advent of Christianity brought a feeling of compassion for the handicapped which resulted in the development of custodial asylums for many severely handicapped individuals. The eighteenth century saw the successful beginnings of education and training developed in the various asylums. During the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the public schools began offering programs and services to selected handicapped youngsters.

Public educational programs for handicapped students began in 1869 with the opening of special day classes for students with severe disabilities. These public school classes grew in number and scope to

---

[124]Ted L. Miller and David A. Sabatino, "An Evaluation of the Teacher Consultant Model as an Approach to Mainstreaming," Exceptional Children, 45 (October, 1978), 86-91.

[125]Jerry Miltenberger, "Mainstreaming-A Different Approach," Education Unlimited, 1 (October, 1979), 52.

include programs for mildly handicapped individuals as well. By the 1950's, many researchers and educators were questioning the effectiveness of these special class programs for the less severely handicapped. Documentation mounted in the 1960's which indicated that many of these students profited in academic and social ways from association with their non-handicapped peers.

Court decisions and legal mandates combined with the research evidence to begin exploration of educational options for certain handicapped students for whom dual enrollment in regular and special education programs was appropriate. This practice was called mainstreaming, and it became increasingly popular during the 1960's and 1970's. The major mainstreaming vehicle in the United States became the special education resource room. While there are a number of resource room models, by far the most popular and the most effective programs provide both direct services to handicapped students and quality assistance to the regular teachers in whose classrooms these youngsters are mainstreamed.

In California the special education resource room program is called the Resource Specialist Program. It is staffed by a specially credentialed teacher who is called a Resource Specialist. The role of the Resource Specialist is somewhat defined in California law and regulations. However, there is ambiguity, overlap and omissions in this legal framework of the role. A review of the literature, local agency job descriptions and reports by Resource Specialists on what their role actually entails resulted in the development of a Resource Specialist Role Survey. This survey included a total of nine comprehensive tasks which were grouped under the three functions of (1) direct services to

students, (2) collaboration/consultation with various individuals who deal with the student, and (3) management/leadership duties which facilitate successful mainstreaming in a variety of ways.

Chapter 3

PROCEDURE

The purpose of this study was to provide a comprehensive, prioritized description of the Resource Specialist role as perceived by the three groups of educators most directly and consistently involved with the educational mainstreaming of handicapped youngsters in California Resource Specialist Programs. The three groups included (1) site administrators who are responsible for the regular education and the Resource Specialist Program in their buildings, (2) classroom teachers who have Resource Specialist Program students mainstreamed into their classes, and (3) Resource Specialists responsible for the operation of site Resource Specialist Programs. Chapter 3 is a discussion of how this task was accomplished. The procedures of the study are presented under the following headings: (1) Survey Development, (2) Sample Selection, (3) Data Collection, and (4) Data Treatment.

Survey Development

An exhaustive review of the literature including relevant journal articles, books, government documents, existing job descriptions and competency lists was conducted to identify a list of the tasks which are generally considered to be part of the Resource Specialist role. Interviews were then conducted with individuals who were involved in the training, credentialing and employment of Resource Specialists, as well as with Resource Specialists themselves, to verify the appropriateness

of the tasks which were drawn from the literature. In addition, interviewees were encouraged to identify additional tasks or responsibilities which they felt were an important part of the Resource Specialist role.

The tasks thus generated were then examined and categorized, duplicates were noted, and a final list of nine tasks was developed which encompassed all of the major activities included in the Resource Specialist role. These nine tasks were grouped according to the three basic functions to which they were related. The direct service function included the tasks of (1) student assessment, (2) direct instruction of students and (3) student counseling. The collaboration/consultation function was directed toward coordination of educational programs and included the tasks of (1) collaborating with parents, (2) collaborating with other educators and (3) collaborating with other individuals and/or agencies involved with the students. The management/leadership function included the tasks of (1) Resource Specialist Program management, (2) special education leadership at the school site, (3) change agent activities. Finally, a Resource Specialist Role Survey was constructed which listed the nine tasks lettered "A" through "I," grouped according to each basic function.

The survey was not anonymous, but confidentiality was assured to all respondents. The survey was divided into three sections; the first requested demographic information. In the second section of the survey, the respondents were asked to react to three issues. First, they were to rank the nine tasks in order of their importance; second, they were asked to rank order the tasks based on the amount of time Resource Specialists spent on each task; and third, they were asked to indicate whether the amount of time spent on each task was sufficient, whether

it should be increased or whether it should be decreased. In the third section of the survey, respondents were asked to list any important additional tasks or responsibilities which they believed should be added to the Resource Specialist role. Provision was also made for any additional comments by the respondents. (See Appendix B for a copy of the survey.)

In order to establish content validity, the survey was submitted to a panel of four persons from each of the following groups; site administrators, classroom teachers and Resource Specialists. Comments and suggestions from the validation panel were evaluated and used as a basis for revising and clarifying the survey. Changes which occurred in the survey as a result of this process were nominal.

Test/re-test reliability was established for the survey instrument using educators from the three groups to be surveyed but who were not part of the study. A total of twenty-five[1] site administrators, classroom teachers and Resource Specialists responded to the survey in an initial mailing and responded again after a three week interval. Comparisons of the paired responses yielded an overall correlation coefficient of .71, thus indicating that the survey proved to be stable over time.

Sample Selection

Educators from those school districts in the state which were

---

[1]This number represented 8 percent of the study sample. Consultation with Dr. Bobby Hopkins, UOP, School of Education, verified this to be an adequate percentage. Further verification is found in Kenneth D. Hopkins and Gene V. Glass, Basic Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1978), pp. 182-83.

part of a pilot Master Plan Region and which were operating Resource Specialist Programs in the Spring of 1981, comprised the population of this study. The 21 Master Plan Regions were identified using information provided by the California State Department of Education. Master Plan Regions selected by the state for funding included representation from urban, suburban and rural areas geographically dispersed throughout California, thus ensuring representation from all of the educational systems which exist in the state.

The California Public School Directory[2] was used to identify the schools in each of the Master Plan Regions. As this information was reviewed, schools with student enrollments under five hundred in average dialy attendance (ADA) were eliminated from consideration. This action was taken because schools of this size normally do not have a full-time Resource Specialist Program. From those schools which had an enrollment of more than five hundred students in ADA, two separate lists were developed. The first list included all the elementary schools (generally grades K-6) whose programs are made up of traditional self-contained classrooms. The second list included all of the remaining school programs which operated departmentalized classrooms. While schools in this category could have departmentalized programs as low as fifth grade, they generally included what are typically the junior and senior high schools (grades 7-12) and are referred to in this study as secondary schools.

The number of schools in each group (elementary and secondary)

---

[2]California Public School Directory (Sacramento: Government Printing Office, 1980).

with enrollments of five hundred students or more in ADA was calculated for each Master Plan Region. A 15 percent sample of the schools in each Region was then randomly selected using the Table of Random Digits.[3] At least two schools were selected from each Master Plan Region (one at the elementary level and one at the secondary level) to ensure that all 21 Regions were represented in the study.

When the sampling process was completed, there were fifty-two elementary (self-contained) and forty-eight secondary (departmentalized) schools selected, making a total of one hundred schools. From these one hundred schools a random sample of educators was selected. This group included one hundred school site administrators who are responsible for the regular education and Resource Specialist Programs in their building, one hundred classroom teachers with Resource Specialist Program students mainstreamed in their classes, and one hundred Resource Specialists responsible for operating the Resource Specialist Programs at the school sites.

Data Collection

An introductory letter, postcard and three copies of the Resource Specialist Role Survey with stamped envelopes for returning the survey were sent to the site administrator listed in the Public School Directory for each of the one hundred schools. Each administrator was asked to fill out a survey, to give one to the Resource Specialist and the third to a classroom teacher having at least one student who was

---

[3]Seymore Sudman, Applied Sampling (New York: Academic Press, 1976), pp. 223-26.

enrolled in the Resource Specialist Program. The administrator was asked to list on the postcard the names of the two teachers to whom she/he gave the surveys and to return the card. This information was used for the second mailing when another copy of the survey was sent directly to each teacher listed who had apparently been given a survey but whose response had not been received. The second mailing was initiated three weeks after the first.

A total of 68 percent of the surveys was returned. The breakdown of the responses for each group was as follows: Out of 100 surveys sent to each group, 71 site administrators responded, 54 classroom teachers responded and 79 Resource Specialists responded.

Data Treatment

The survey results were tabulated for each of the three respondent groups (site administrators, classroom teachers and Resource Specialists). It was the intent of this study to determine if significant differences existed in the perceptions of the Resource Specialist role, (1) among the three respondent groups, (2) between elementary educators and secondary educators, and (3) between Resource Specialist with two years or less experience and those with more than two years experience. To accomplish this intent, the following statistical procedures were utilized: (1) the one-way analysis of variance, (2) the two-tailed t-test of significance, (3) the modified least significant difference multiple comparison, and (4) the chi-square cross tabulation test.

For all calculations, the level of significance was set at the

.05 level.[4]

Summary

A literature review and interviews were conducted to construct a Resource Specialist Role Survey which included a list of nine tasks which encompassed all important components of the Resource Specialist role. Three hundred educators were surveyed and 204 responded, a return of 68 percent. The survey sampled site administrators, classroom teachers and Resource Specialists in California Master Plan Regions who were involved with existing Resource Specialist Programs in the Spring of 1981. Survey results were analyzed to determine if any significant differences existed among respondent groups, between elementary and secondary level educators and between Resource Specialists with varying amounts of experience. In Chapter 4 the data are presented and analyzed. In Chapter 5, the study is summarized, conclusions are drawn and discussed, and recommendations for future research are presented.

---

[4]In consultation with Dr. Bobby Hopkins, UOP, School of Education, these statistical procedures and the level of significance were determined to be appropriate for this study.

Chapter 4

DATA ANALYSIS

The data reported in this chapter are organized into three sections: Analysis of the Sample, Analysis of the Survey Results, and Summary. The first section includes a description of the respondents by position, by educational setting and by years of experience in the Resource Specialist role. The second section addresses each of the research questions proposed for the study. In the third and final section of the chapter, the data and findings are summarized.

Analysis of the Sample

An intensive review of the related literature, current Resource Specialist job descriptions, legal guidelines and personal interviews resulted in the development of the Resource Specialist Role Survey as part of this study. Three hundred surveys were distributed to Master Plan Region educators in the following three groups: (1) one hundred site administrators who were responsible for the regular and Resource Specialist Programs in their schools, (2) one hundred classroom teachers who had Resource Specialist Program students mainstreamed into their classes, and (3) one hundred Resource Specialists who staffed and operated site Resource Specialist Programs.

Following the first mailing, survey responses were received from 66 Resource Specialists, 60 site administrators and 46 classroom teachers. A second mailing, three weeks after the first, which included a second letter of request and an additional survey form, yielded

additional responses from 13 Resource Specialists, 11 site administrators and 9 classroom teachers. A review of the two sets of responses from each group revealed no substantial differences; therefore, both sets were combined and treated as one group. This process resulted in a total of 79 responses from Resource Specialists (79%), 71 from school site administrators (71%) and 54 from classroom teachers (54%).

These 204 total responses from the sample of 300 individuals resulted in an overall return rate of 68 percent. As might be expected, the highest percentage of survey returns came from Resource Specialists. The return from site administrators was slightly lower, while the rate of response from classroom teachers was substantially lower. This information is presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Survey Responses from Resource Specialists, Site Administrators and Classroom Teachers

Position	Number of Responses	Percent of Response
Resource Specialist	79	79%
Site Administrator	71	71%
Classroom Teacher	54	54%

The survey responses from the three educator groups were examined to determine how each group perceived the relative importance of the Resource Specialists tasks, how each perceived the relative amount of time which is spent on the tasks, and how each perceived the

amount of time which should be spent on the tasks. Comparisons were then drawn among the three groups to identify any significant differences of perception which existed in each of the three areas (task importance, time spent on each task and time which should be spent on each task). The results of these comparisons are included in this chapter.

The survey responses were further examined to determine any significant differences which existed in the perceptions of elementary and secondary educators regarding task importance and the time perceived as being spent on each task. Site administrators, classroom teachers and Resource Specialists were divided into two groups based upon whether their schools were primarily comprised of self-contained or departmentalized classes. As a rule, self-contained programs prevailed at the elementary level (grades K-6) while departmentalized classes were generally found at the secondary level (grades 7-12). Schools including both elementary and secondary grades were eliminated from consideration for this study.

While there are many differences which characterize elementary and secondary schools, only the programmatic and staffing differences inherent in self-contained and departmentalized programs were used to differentiate elementary and secondary schools. The decision to use only this criteria was prompted by numerous interview comments from educators who perceived a substantial difference in the Resource Specialist role at elementary and secondary levels because of the differences between self-contained and departmentalized programs. Difficulties cited as unique to secondary Resource Specialists revolved around mainstreaming each of the 24 to 28 students into as many as five

different classes on a daily basis. Specific secondary concerns dealt with the following issues: (1) helping students to understand and cope with a variety of teaching styles, techniques and expectations, (2) collaborating with many more classroom teachers at the secondary level, (3) less flexibility of scheduling because of departmentalized programs, and (4) having to address a wider range of student needs at the secondary level.

As a result of this input and of supporting literature which indicated similar views and concerns about secondary mainstreaming programs, an examination of survey responses from educators at elementary and secondary sites was deemed appropriate for this study. The sampling process used in the study resulted in the identification of 52 elementary schools and 48 secondary schools. Of the 156 surveys sent to elementary principals, classroom teachers and Resource Specialists, 98 were returned, for a total elementary response of 63 percent. Of the 144 surveys sent to secondary educators, 104 were returned, yielding a response rate of 72 percent. These data are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2

Survey Responses from Educators in Elementary and Secondary Schools

Educational Setting	Number of Schools	Number of Surveys Sent	Number of Responses Returned	Percent of Responses Returned
Elementary (Self-Contained Programs)	52	156	98	63%
Secondary (Departmentalized Programs)	48	144	104	72%

The final examination of the survey results utilized the responses of the Resource Specialist group alone. The responses of Resource Specialists with two years or less experience in the role were compared with those of Resource Specialists having more than two years experience to determine whether there were significant differences in their perceptions of task importance and of the relative amount of time they perceived themselves spending on each task. Of the 79 Resource Specialists who responded to the survey, 33 had two years or less experience while 46 had more than two years in the Resource Specialist role.

Analyses of Survey Results

The purpose of this study was to provide a prioritized, comprehensive description of the major tasks of the Resource Specialist role as perceived by the three groups of educators most directly and consistently involved with the educational mainstreaming of handicapped youngsters through the Resource Specialist Program. Each research question proposed for this study is presented and discussed in this section. For all research questions involving statistical significance, the .05 level of significance was selected for use. According to Sax,[1] this level is commonly used and accepted in educational research. Items significant at the .05 level indicate that the researcher can be 95 percent confident that the differences are not due to chance. In this study, only those Resource Specialist tasks which were significant at the .05 level or lower are discussed.

---

[1]Gilbert Sax, Foundations of Educational Research (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1979), p. 381.

1. What is the relative importance of the various tasks which comprise the Resource Specialist role, as perceived by site administrators, classroom teachers and Resource Specialists?

To answer this question, a forced choice ranking of the nine tasks on the Resource Specialist Role Survey was made by each respondent. Numbers were to be assigned in order with the number "one" given to the task perceived to be the most important task and the number "nine" given to the least important task. A mean score for each task was then calculated for each of the three respondent groups (site administrators, classroom teachers and Resource Specialists). Therefore, the lowest mean score indicated the task perceived to be most important while the highest mean score indicated the task perceived to be the least important. These data were then arrayed for examination.

There was agreement among site administrators, classroom teachers and Resource Specialists on the two Resource Specialist tasks perceived to be most important. All three groups ranked direct instruction of students first in order of importance, and student assessment second. Resource Specialists and administrators shared the perception that the third most important task was Resource Specialist Program management. However, classroom teachers ranked collaborating with educators third. Identification of the task ranked fourth in perceived order of importance was somewhat irregular. Classroom teachers gave this rank to the task of Resource Specialist Program management while Resource Specialists ranked collaborating with other educators as fourth. With administrators, however, two tasks received identical mean scores and were, therefore, both ranked fourth. These tasks were collaboration with educators and collaboration with parents. Both classroom teachers and Resource Specialists perceived the fifth and

sixth ranking tasks to be student counseling and collaborating with parents. Administrators, however, ranked student counseling as the sixth most important Resource Specialist task.

The three least important tasks, those ranked seventh, eighth and ninth, are very similar for all three groups of educators. Special education leadership at the school site was judged to be seventh and the change agent task eighth by administrators and classroom teachers. Resource Specialists reversed the order ranking the change agent task seventh and site special education leadership eighth. All three educator groups perceived that the least important task of Resource Specialists was collaborating with others.

Overall, little variation in the perceptions of the relative importance of the tasks which comprise the Resource Specialist role was noted among the three educator groups. There was agreement among all three groups (site administrators, Resource Specialists and classroom teachers) on the two most important and the least important tasks which make up the Resource Specialist role. For the remaining six tasks, two of the three educator groups consistently gave identical rankings while the third groups' rankings of the items were only slightly different. These results are presented in Table 3.

2. What is the relative amount of time spent on the various tasks which make up the Resource Specialist role, as perceived by site administrators, classroom teachers and Resource Specialists?

To answer this question, each respondent ranked the nine tasks in terms of the relative amount of time perceived to be spent by the Resource Specialist on each task. The rankings ranged from "one", which indicated the task on which the Resource Specialist spent the most time, to "nine", which designated the task on which the least amount of time

Table 3

Rank Order of Mean Scores for Resource Specialist Tasks in Order of Perceived Importance by Site Administrators, Classroom Teachers and Resource Specialists

Tasks	Administrators N=71		Classroom Teachers N=54		Resource Specialists N=79		All Groups N=204	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
1. Direct Instruction of Students (Examples include selecting, adapting, developing, preparing and using materials, media, strategies and techniques in cognitive, affective and psychomotor areas.)	2.34	1	2.00	1	1.96	1	2.08	1
2. Student Assessment (Examples include student observation; selection, administration and interpretation of tests; diagnosis of strengths, weaknesses.)	3.60	2	3.70	2	3.28	2	3.48	2
3. Resource Specialist Program Management (Examples include developing, organizing, supervising and maintaining a quality program along with developing, implementing and reviewing each assigned student's Individualized Education Program (IEP).	4.21	3	4.48	4	4.24	3	4.29	3

Table 3 (continued)

Tasks	Administrators N=71		Classroom Teachers N=54		Resource Specialists N=79		All Groups N=204	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
4. Collaborating With Educators (Examples include communicating, consulting and conferencing with administrators, teachers, support personnel, paraprofessionals about scheduling, curriculum, instruction, behavior, proficiencies, graduation credits.)	4.85	4	4.25	3	4.46	4	4.52	4
5. Student Counseling (Examples include group and/or individual work in career/vocational, personal, interpersonal, social and self-esteem areas.)	4.92	6	4.85	5	4.84	5	4.87	5
6. Collaborating With Parents (Examples include communicating, counsulting and conferencing about home/school support, student needs, programs, services, resources.)	4.85	4	5.03	6	5.25	6	5.07	6

Table 3 (continued)

Tasks	Administrators N=71		Classroom Teachers N=54		Resource Specialists N=79		All Groups N=204	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
7. Site Special Education Leadership (Examples include coordinating the school site special education referral process, scheduling IEP meetings, monitoring time lines and legal compliance issues.)	6.02	7	6.78	7	6.74	8	6.53	7
8. Change Agent (Examples include promoting awareness, understanding and acceptance of handicapped individuals, mainstreaming and the Resource Specialist Program as well as assisting with staff development and parent education related to special education.)	6.51	8	6.88	8	6.68	7	6.68	8
9. Collaborating With Others (Examples include communicating and consulting with Social Service Agencies, Vocational and Regional Centers, physicians and therapists to collect and/or report student needs, programs, information.)	7.49	9	7.05	9	7.41	9	7.34	9

1 = most important
9 = least important

was spent. A mean score was then calculated for each task for each of the three respondent groups. Therefore, the task with the lowest mean score was the one on which the most time was perceived to be spent while the task with the highest mean was the one perceived to have the least amount of time spent on it. These data were then arrayed and examined.

There was consensus among the three educator groups about the three tasks on which the Resource Specialist is perceived to spend the most amount of time. Administrators, classroom teachers and Resource Specialists all ranked these tasks, in order as follows: (1) direct instruction of students, (2) student assessment and (3) Resource Specialist Program management. The tasks ranked fourth through seventh in terms of the perceived amount of Resource Specialist time spent were the same for administrators and Resource Specialists. In descending order, they were collaborating with educators, student counseling, collaborating with parents, and special education leadership at the school site. Classroom teachers, although similar, assigned the fourth through seventh rankings in the following way: collaboration with parents, collaboration with educators, student counseling and collaboration with others.

The eighth ranked task was the only one on which there was no agreement among the three educator groups. Administrators identified collaborating with others as eighth and the change agent task as ninth. Classroom teachers indicated that special education leadership at the school site was eighth but agreed that the change agent task had the least amount of time spent on it. Resource Specialists perceived the change agent task as eighth and collaborating with others as ninth.

As with the ranking to task importance, little variation in the

perceptions of the amount of time spent on each Resource Specialist task was noted amoung the three educator groups. These results are presented in Table 4.

3. Are there significant differences among the three educator groups regarding their perceptions of the relative importance of the tasks which make up the Resource Specialist role?

To answer this question, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to determine whether significant differences existed in the way site administrators, classroom teachers and Resource Specialists perceived the relative importance of the tasks on the Resource Specialist Role Survey. The ANOVA provided for a simultaneous examination of the mean task scores for all three educator groups. Thus, ANOVA indicated whether at least one of the three mean scores deviated significantly from at least one of the other mean scores on any of the nine Resource Specialist tasks. There were no significant differences between the three educator groups in the perceptions of the relative importance of the nine tasks on the Resource Specialist Role Survey. The results are presented in Table 5.

4. Are there significant differences among the three educator groups regarding their perceptions of the relative amount of time spent on the tasks which make up the Resource Specialist role?

An analyses of variance was used to determine whether site administrators, classroom teachers and Resource Specialists differed significantly in the way they perceived the relative amount of time spent by the Resource Specialist on each task. Significant differences were found for three of the nine tasks included on the Resource Specialist Role Survey. These tasks were direct instruction of students,

Table 4

Rank Order of Mean Scores for Resource Specialist Tasks in Order of Perceived Time Spent on Each Task by Administrators, Classroom Teachers and Resource Specialists

Tasks	Administrators N=71		Classroom Teachers N=54		Resource Specialists N=79		All Groups N=204	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
1. Direct Instruction of Students (Examples include selecting, adapting, developing, preparing and using materials, media, strategies and techniques in cognitive, affective and psychomotor areas.)	2.27	1	2.55	1	1.59	1	2.04	1
2. Student Assessment (Examples include student observation; selection, administration and interpretation of tests; diagnosis of strengths, weaknesses.)	3.68	2	3.26	2	3.32	2	3.42	2
3. Resource Specialist Program Management (Examples include developing, organizing, supervising and maintaining a quality program along with developing, implementing and reviewing each assigned student's Individualized Education Program (IEP).	4.27	3	4.24	3	3.74	3	4.03	3

Table 4 (continued)

Tasks	Administrators N=71		Classroom Teachers N=54		Resource Specialists N=79		All Groups N=204	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
4. Collaborating With Educators (Examples include communicating, consulting and conferencing with administrators, teachers, support personnel, paraprofessionals about scheduling, curriculum, instruction, behavior, proficiencies, graduation credits.)	4.59	4	4.53	5	4.37	4	4.48	4
5. Student Counseling (Examples include group and/or individual work in career/vocational, personal, interpersonal, social and self-esteem areas.)	5.05	5	5.18	6	5.22	5	5.16	5
6. Collaborating With Parents (Examples include communicating, consulting and conferencing about home/school support, student needs, programs, services, resources.)	5.32	6	4.37	4	5.57	6	5.18	6

Table 4 (continued)

Tasks	Administrators N=71		Classroom Teachers N=54		Resource Specialists N=79		All Groups N=204	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
7. Site Special Education Leadership (Examples include coordinating the school site special education referral process, scheduling IEP meetings, monitoring time lines and legal compliance issues.)	6.10	7	6.61	8	5.66	7	6.03	7
8. Collaborating With Others (Examples include communicating and consulting with Social Service Agencies, Vocational and Regional Centers, physicians and therapists to collect and/or report student needs, programs, information.)	6.82	8	6.47	7	7.79	9	7.16	8
9. Change Agent (Examples include promoting awareness, understanding and acceptance of handicapped individuals, mainstreaming and the Resource Specialist Program as well as assisting with staff development and parent education related to special education.)	6.93	9	7.68	9	7.66	8	7.45	9

1 = most time spent
9 = least time spent

Table 5

ANOVA of Mean Scores for Administrators, Classroom Teachers and Resource Specialists for Perceived Importance of Resource Specialist Tasks

Tasks	MEAN SCORES			
	Administrators N=71	Classroom Teachers N=54	Resource Specialists N=79	F Ratio
1. Direct Instruction of Students (Examples include selecting, adapting, developing, preparing and using materials, media, strategies and techniques in cognitive, affective and psychomotor areas.)	2.34	2.00	1.96	0.659
2. Student Assessment (Examples include student observation; selection, administration and interpretation of tests; diagnosis of strengths, weaknesses.)	3.60	3.70	3.28	0.493
3. Resource Specialist Program Management (Examples include developing, organizing, supervising and maintaining a quality program along with developing, implementing and reviewing each assigned student's Individualized Education Program (IEP).	4.21	4.48	4.24	0.181

Table 5 (continued)

Tasks	MEAN SCORES			
	Administrators N=71	Classroom Teachers N=54	Resource Specialists N=79	F Ratio
4. Collaborating With Educators (Examples include communicating, consulting and conferencing with administrators, teachers, support personnel, paraprofessionals about scheduling, curriculum, instruction, behavior, proficiencies, graduation credits.)	4.85	4.25	4.46	1.233
5. Student Counseling (Examples include group and/or individual work in career/vocational, personal, interpersonal, social and self-esteem areas.)	4.92	4.85	4.84	0.017
6. Collaborating With Parents (Examples include communicating, consulting and conferencing about home/school support, student needs, programs, services, resources.)	4.85	5.03	5.25	0.867
7. Site Special Education Leadership (Examples include coordinating the school site special education referral process, scheduling IEP meetings, monitoring time lines and legal compliance issues.)	6.02	6.78	6.74	2.060

Table 5 (continued)

Tasks	MEAN SCORES			
	Administrators N=71	Classroom Teachers N=54	Resource Specialists N=79	F Ratio
8. Change Agent (Examples include promoting awareness, understanding and acceptance of handicapped individuals, mainstreaming and the Resource Specialist Program as well as assisting with staff development and parent education related to special education.)	6.51	6.88	6.68	0.258
9. Collaborating With Others (Examples include communicating and consulting with Social Service Agencies, Vocational and Regional Centers, physicians and therapists to collect and/or report student needs, programs, information.)	7.49	7.05	7.41	0.678

collaborating with parents and collaborating with others. The results are presented in Table 6.

Further analysis of the three tasks for which differences were significant at the .05 level was done using the modified least significant difference multiple comparison. This procedure indicated for each task which of the three educator groups deviated significantly from the other groups in their perceptions of the relative amount of time spent by the Resource Specialist on the task in question.

For the task of direct student instruction, all three educator groups had perceived it as utilizing the most Resource Specialist time of any task. Yet, the significantly lower mean task score of Resource Specialists indicated that they perceived direct instruction as being significantly more time consuming than did site administrators and classroom teachers. The results are presented in Table 7.

The second task on which the educator groups differed significantly was their perception of the amount of Resource Specialist time spent collaborating with parents. A modified least significant difference multiple comparison indicated that, although administrators and Resource Specialists viewed the amount of time spent on this task more alike than did classroom teachers, a significant difference existed among the perceptions of all three groups. Classroom teachers saw collaborating with parents as taking more Resource Specialist time than did Resource Specialists themselves, while site administrators' perceptions of task time spent fell between those of the other two groups. The results are presented in Table 8.

Collaboration with others was the final task for which there was a significant difference in the perceptions of the three educator

Table 6

ANOVA of Mean Scores for Administrators, Classroom Teachers and Resource Specialists for Most to Least Amount of Time Spent Per Resource Specialist Task

Tasks	MEAN SCORES			
	Administrators N=71	Classroom Teachers N=54	Resource Specialists N=79	F Ratio
1. Direct Instruction of Students (Examples include selecting, adapting, developing, preparing and using materials, media, strategies and techniques in cognitive, affective and psychomotor areas.)	2.27	2.55	1.59	3.336*
2. Student Assessment (Examples include student observation; selection, administration and interpretation of tests; diagnosis of strengths, weaknesses.)	3.68	3.26	3.32	0.493
3. Resource Specialist Program Management (Examples include developing, organizing, supervising and maintaining a quality program along with developing, implementing and reviewing each assigned student's Individualized Education Program (IEP).)	4.27	4.24	3.74	1.106

Table 6 (continued)

Tasks	MEAN SCORES			
	Administrators N=71	Classroom Teachers N=54	Resource Specialists N=79	F Ratio
4. Collaborating With Educators (Examples include communicating, consulting and conferencing with administrators, teachers, support personnel, paraprofessionals about scheduling, curriculum, instruction, behavior, proficiencies, graduation credits.)	4.59	4.53	4.37	0.234
5. Student Counseling (Examples include group and/or individual work in career/vocational, personal, interpersonal, social and self-esteem areas.)	5.05	5.18	5.22	0.086
6. Collaborating With Parents (Examples include communicating, consulting and conferencing about home/school support, student needs, programs, services, resources.)	5.32	4.37	5.57	5.710**
7. Site Special Education Leadership (Examples include coordinating the school site special education referral process, scheduling IEP meetings, monitoring time lines and legal compliance issues.)	6.10	6.61	5.66	2.548

Table 6 (continued)

Tasks	MEAN SCORES			
	Administrators N=71	Classroom Teachers N=54	Resource Specialists N=79	F Ratio
8. Collaborating With Others (Examples include communicating and consulting with Social Service Agencies, Vocational and Regional Centers, physicians and therapists to collect and/or report student needs, programs, information.)	6.82	6.47	7.79	6.060**
9. Change Agent (Examples include promoting awareness, understanding and acceptance of handicapped individuals, mainstreaming and the Resource Specialist Program as well as assisting with staff development and parent education related to special education.)	6.93	7.68	7.66	2.545

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at the .01 level

Table 7

ANOVA for Administrators, Classroom Teachers and Resource Specialists Perceptions of Time Spent on Direct Instruction of Students

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares
Between Groups	2	25.85	12.92
Within Groups	144	557.91	3.87
Total	146	583.76	

F= 3.34 (significant at the .05 level)

Table 8

ANOVA for Administrators, Classroom Teachers and Resource Specialists Perceptions of Time Spent Collaborating With Parents

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares
Between Groups	2	35.72	17.86
Within Groups	144	450.33	3.13
Total	146	486.05	

F = 5.71 (significant at the .01 level)

groups about the relative amount of Resource Specialist time spent. A modified least significant difference multiple comparison revealed significant differences in the way all three educator groups perceived the amount of time spent collaborating with others. Administrators perceived collaboration with others at the high extreme, taking the most time. Resource Specialists were at the other extreme, perceiving the least time spent, while classroom teachers' perceptions were between those of the other educators. The results are presented in Table 9.

Table 9

ANOVA for Administrators, Classroom Teachers and Resource Specialists Perceptions of Time Spent Collaborating With Others

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares
Between Groups	2	48.40	24.20
Within Groups	144	575.00	3.99
Total	146	623.40	

F = 6.06 (significant at the .01 level)

Analysis by Educational Setting

5. Is there a significant difference in the way elementary and secondary educators perceive the relative importance of the tasks which make up the Resource Specialist role?

To answer this question, mean scores for each of the nine tasks were calculated for all elementary educators (administrators, classroom teachers and Resource Specialists for grades K-6), and for all secondary

educators (administrators, classroom teachers and Resource Specialists for grades 7-12). A two-tailed t test was used to determine whether any mean score differences between the elementary and secondary groups were significant at the .05 level. Elementary and secondary educators differed significantly in the perceptions of the relative importance of two of the nine Resource Specialist tasks. The lower mean score of secondary educators for student counseling indicated they perceived the task as significantly more important than did elementary educators. The mean score differences for the change agent task also indicated that secondary educators perceived this task as significantly more important than did educators in an elementary school setting. The results are presented in Table 10.

6. Is there a significant difference in the way elementary and secondary educators perceive the relative amount of time spent on the tasks which make up the Resource Specialist role?

To determine whether any differences existed in the perceptions of the relative amount of time spent on the various Resource Specialist tasks, mean scores for all elementary (grades K-6) and all secondary (grades 7-12) educators were calculated. A two-tailed t test was utilized to determine whether the mean score differences were significant at the .05 level. Mean scores on four of the nine tasks on the Resource Specialist Role Survey, were significantly different for elementary and secondary educators. Elementary educators perceived the Resource Specialist as spending significantly more time on student assessment and collaborating with educators. Educators at the secondary level perceived significantly more time spent by the Resource Specialist on student counseling and on change agent activities. The results are presented in Table 11.

Table 10

Means and t Value Mean Differences Between
Elementary and Secondary Educators on
Perceived Task Importance

Tasks	Educational Setting	Mean Score	t Value	2-tail Probability
1. Direct Instruction of Students (Examples include selecting, adapting, developing, preparing and using materials, media, strategies and techniques in cognitive, affective and psychomotor areas.)	Elementary	1.961	-0.82	0.412
	Secondary	2.205		
2. Student Assessment (Examples include student observation; selection, administration and interpretation of tests; diagnosis of strengths, weaknesses.)	Elementary	3.224	-1.48	0.142
	Secondary	3.769		
3. Resource Specialist Program Management (Examples include developing, organizing, supervising and maintaining a quality program along with developing, implementing and reviewing each assigned student's Individualized Education Program (IEP).)	Elementary	4.263	-0.02	0.987
	Secondary	4.269		

Table 10 (continued)

Tasks	Educational Setting	Mean Score	t Value	2-tail Probability
4. Collaborating With Educators (Examples include communicating, consulting and conferencing with administrators, teachers, support personnel, paraprofessionals about scheduling, curriculum, instruction, behavior, proficiencies, graduation credits.)	Elementary	4.276	-1.54	0.125
	Secondary	4.731		
5. Student Counseling (Examples include group and/or individual work in career/vocational, personal, interpersonal, social and self-esteem areas.)	Elementary	5.395	3.18	0.002**
	Secondary	4.295		
6. Collaborating With Parents (Examples include communicating, consulting and conferencing about home/school support, student needs, programs, services, resources.)	Elementary	4.855	-1.76	0.081
	Secondary	5.308		
7. Site Special Education Leadership (Examples include coordinating the school site special education referral process, scheduling IEP meetings, monitoring time lines and legal compliance issues.)	Elementary	6.382	-0.93	0.355
	Secondary	6.692		

Table 10 (continued)

Tasks	Educational Setting	Mean Score	t Value	2-tail Probability
8. Change Agent (Examples include promoting awareness, understanding and acceptance of handicapped individuals, mainstreaming and the Resource Specialist Program as well as assisting with staff development and parent education related to special education.)	Elementary	7.079	2.03	0.044*
	Secondary	6.321		
9. Collaborating With Others (Examples include communicating and consulting with Social Service Agencies, Vocational and Regional Centers, physicians and therapists to collect and/or report student needs, programs, information.)	Elementary	7.276	-0.48	0.629
	Secondary	7.423		

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at the .01 level

Table 11

Means and t Value Mean Differences Between
Elementary and Secondary Educators on
Perceived Task Time Spent

Tasks	Educational Setting	Mean Score	t Value	2-tail Probability
1. Direct Instruction of Students (Examples include selecting, adapting, developing, preparing and using materials, media, strategies and techniques in cognitive, affective and psychomotor areas.)	Elementary	1.833	-1.24	0.216
	Secondary	2.240		
2. Student Assessment (Examples include student observation; selection, administration and interpretation of tests; diagnosis of strengths, weaknesses.)	Elementary	2.847	-3.28	0.001**
	Secondary	3.960		
3. Resource Specialist Program Management (Examples include developing, organizing, supervising and maintaining a quality program along with developing, implementing and reviewing each assigned student's Individualized Education Program (IEP).)	Elementary	3.819	-1.18	0.240
	Secondary	4.227		

Table 11 (continued)

Tasks	Educational Setting	Mean Score	t Value	2-tail Probability
4. Collaborating With Educators (Examples include communicating, consulting and conferencing with administrators, teachers, support personnel, paraprofessionals about scheduling, curriculum, instruction, behavior, proficiencies, graduation credits.)	Elementary	4.153	-2.25	0.026*
	Secondary	4.787		
5. Student Counseling (Examples include group and/or individual work in career/vocational, personal, interpersonal, social and self-esteem areas.)	Elementary	5.958	4.78	0.000**
	Secondary	4.387		
6. Collaborating With Parents (Examples include communicating, consulting and conferencing about home/school support, student needs, programs, services, resources.)	Elementary	5.208	0.16	0.873
	Secondary	5.160		
7. Site Special Education Leadership (Examples include coordinating the school site special education referral process, scheduling IEP Meetings, monitoring time lines and legal compliance issues.)	Elementary	6.153	0.68	0.498
	Secondary	5.920		

Table 11 (continued)

Tasks	Educational Setting	Mean Score	t Value	2-tail Probability
8. Collaborating With Others (Examples include communicating and consulting with Social Service Agencies, Vocational and Regional Centers, physicians and therapists to collect and/or report student needs, programs, information.)	Elementary	7.278	0.70	0.486
	Secondary	7.040		
9. Change Agent (Examples include promoting awareness, understanding and acceptance of handicapped individuals, mainstreaming and the Resource Specialist Program as well as assisting with staff development and parent education related to special education.)	Elementary	7.778	2.17	0.032*
	Secondary	7.133		

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at the .001 level

Analysis by Years of Experience

7. Is there a significant difference in the way Resource Specialists perceive the relative importance of specific tasks in the Resource Specialist role based on whether they have been Resource Specialists two years or less or more than two years?

To answer this question, the mean score for each task was calculated for Resource Specialists who had been in that role for two years or less or for more than two years. A two-tailed t test was utilized to determine whether mean score differences were significant at the .05 level. No significant differences with regard to the relative importance of the nine tasks were found between Resource Specialists with two years or less experience and those with over two years experience. The results are presented in Table 12.

8. Is there a significant difference in the way Resource Specialists perceive the relative amount of time spent on each task based on whether they have been Resource Specialists two years or less or more than two years?

To determine whether any differences existed in the perceptions of the relative amount of time spent by the Resource Specialist on the various tasks, mean scores were calculated for Resource Specialists with two years experience or less and for those with more than two years experience. A two-tailed t test was used to determine whether mean score differences were significant at the .05 level. One task, site special education leadership, had significantly different mean scores. Resource Specialists with two years or less experience perceived significantly more time spent on site special education leadership than did Resource Specialists with more than two years experience. Results are presented in Table 13.

Table 12

Means and t Value of Mean Differences in Perceptions of Task Importance by Resource Specialists Based Upon Years of Experience

Tasks	Years of Experience	Mean Score	t Value	2-tail Probability
1. Direct Instruction of Students (Examples include selecting, adapting, developing, preparing and using materials, media, strategies and techniques in cognitive, affective and psychomotor areas.)	2 or less	1.828	-0.59	0.558
	Over 2	2.051		
2. Student Assessment (Examples include student observation; selection, administration and interpretation of tests; diagnosis of strengths, weaknesses.)	2 or less	3.000	-1.04	0.302
	Over 2	3.487		
3. Resource Specialist Program Management (Examples include developing, organizing, supervising and maintaining a quality program along with developing, implementing and reviewing each assigned student's Individualized Education Program (IEP).)	2 or less	4.414	0.56	0.575
	Over 2	4.103		

Table 12 (continued)

Tasks	Years of Experience	Mean Score	t Value	2-tail Probability
4. Collaborating With Educators (Examples include communicating, consulting and conferencing with administrators, teachers, support personnel, paraprofessionals about scheduling, curriculum, instruction, behavior, proficiencies, graduation credits.)	2 or less	4.621	0.65	0.518
	Over 2	4.333		
5. Student Counseling (Examples include group and/or individual work in career/vocational, personal, interpersonal, social and self-esteem areas.)	2 or less	4.931	0.29	0.773
	Over 2	4.769		
6. Collaborating With Parents (Examples include communicating, consulting and conferencing about home/school support, student needs, programs, services, resources.)	2 or less	5.345	0.41	0.686
	Over 2	5.180		
7. Site Special Education Leadership (Examples include coordinating the school site special education referral process, scheduling IEP meetings, monitoring time lines and legal compliance issues.)	2 or less	6.379	-1.34	0.186
	Over 2	7.000		

Table 12 (continued)

Tasks	Years of Experience	Mean Score	t Value	2-tail Probability
8. Change Agent (Examples include promoting awareness, understanding and acceptance of handicapped individuals, mainstreaming and the Resource Specialist Program as well as assisting with staff development and parent education related to special education.)	2 or less	7.035	1.00	0.321
	Over 2	6.410		
9. Collaborating With Others (Examples include communicating and consulting with Social Service Agencies, Vocational and Regional Centers, physicians and therapists to collect and/or report student needs, programs, information.)	2 or less	7.241	-0.68	0.502
	Over 2	7.539		

Table 13

Means and t Value of Mean Differences in Perceptions of Task Time Spent by Resource Specialists Based Upon Years of Experience

Tasks	Years of Experience	Mean Score	t Value	2-tail Probability
1. Direct Instruction of Students (Examples include selecting, adapting, developing, preparing and using materials, media, strategies and techniques in cognitive, affective and psychomotor areas.)	2 or less	1.704	0.64	0.526
	Over 2	1.500		
2. Student Assessment (Examples include student observation; selection, administration and interpretation of tests; diagnosis of strengths, weaknesses.)	2 or less	2.926	-1.42	0.161
	Over 2	3.605		
3. Resource Specialist Program Management (Examples include developing, organizing, supervising and maintaining a quality program along with developing, implementing and reviewing each assigned student's Individualized Education Program (IEP).	2 or less	4.296	1.72	0.092
	Over 2	3.342		

Table 13 (continued)

Tasks	Years of Experience	Mean Score	t Value	2-tail Probability
4. Collaborating With Educators (Examples include communicating, consulting and conferencing with administrators, teachers, support personnel, paraprofessionals about scheduling, curriculum, instruction, behavior, proficiencies, graduation credits.)	2 or less	4.630	1.11	0.269
	Over 2	4.184		
5. Student Counseling (Examples include group and/or individual work in career/vocational, personal, interpersonal, social and self-esteem areas.)	2 or less	5.741	1.73	0.088
	Over 2	4.842		
6. Collaborating With Parents (Examples include communicating, consulting and conferencing about home/school support, student needs, programs, services, resources.)	2 or less	5.519	-0.20	0.845
	Over 2	5.605		
7. Site Special Education Leadership (Examples include coordinating the school site special education referral process, scheduling IEP meetings, monitoring time lines and legal compliance issues.)	2 or less	4.778	-3.07	0.003*
	Over 2	6.290		

Table 13 (continued)

Tasks	Years of Experience	Mean Score	t Value	2-tail Probability
8. Collaborating With Others (Examples include communicating and consulting with Social Service Agencies, Vocational and Regional Centers, physicians and therapists to collect and/or report student needs, programs, information.)	2 or less	7.556	-1.09	0.281
	Over 2	7.947		
9. Change Agent (Examples include promoting awareness, understanding and acceptance of handicapped individuals, mainstreaming and the Resource Specialist Program as well as assisting with staff development and parent education related to special education.)	2 or less	7.889	0.97	0.337
	Over 2	7.500		

*Significant at the .01 level

Analysis of Time Which Should be Spent

9. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of site administrators, classroom teachers and Resource Specialists regarding the amount of time which should be spent on each Resource Specialist task?

To answer this question, each respondent indicated whether the time spent on each of the nine Resource Specialist tasks should be more, less or should remain the same. The chi-square cross tabulation, designed to evaluate research questions involving relative frequencies (proportions) of various groups, was utilized with the data from each of the three educator groups. The chi-square calculations indicated that differences among the three educator groups in terms of how much time they perceive should be allocated to each of the nine tasks were significant at the .05 level for four tasks. These tasks were direct instruction, student counseling, collaborating with parents and change agent.

In the area of direct instruction, the greatest differences were found between Resource Specialists and administrators. For example, approximately 63 percent of the administrators felt the time spent on direct instruction of students should remain the same, while only 43.4 percent of the Resource Specialists shared that view. It was also noted that 49 percent of the classroom teachers believed that direct instruction warranted more time while only 35.4 percent of the administrators held that view.

In the area of student counseling, there was a spread of more than 28 percentage points between educators who felt the amount of time spent on student counseling should remain the same. Slightly more than 30 percent of the Resource Specialists held this view while almost twice

as many (58.5%) administrators believed that the time spent was adequate. The spread with respect to those educators who felt more time should be spent on student counseling was almost as great (25.1 percentage points). Approximately 60 percent of the Resource Specialists believed that more time should be spent on this task while only 35.4 percent of the administrators shared this view.

Almost 32 percentage points separated those educators who thought that more time should be spent collaborating with parents. Approximately 58 percent of the Resource Specialists held this view, while only 26.2 percent of the administrators agreed with it. With regard to the eductors who felt that the same amount of time should continue to be spent collaborating with parents, there was a 20 point difference in the percentages. Approximately 58 percent of the administrators indicated that the same amount of time should be spent on this task while only 39.2 percent of the Resource Specialists recorded this view.

The final task for which a significant difference in terms of the amount of time which should be spent by Resource Specialists was the change agent task. The largest differences in percentages were found between Resource Specialists and administrators. Slightly more than 56 percent of the Resource Specialists suggested that more time should be spent on the task while only 29.2 percent of the administrators indicated that view. Comparing the responses of educators who felt the same amount of time should be devoted to this task, 61.5 percent of the administrators agreed the time spent should remain the same, while 39.6 percent of the classroom teachers reflected that view.

Overall, in 16 of the 27 percentage comparisons of the amount

of time which should be spent on each Resource Specialist task, administrators and Resource Specialists tended to represent opposite ends of the continuum. Most often, classroom teachers were somewhere between the other two groups. The results are presented in Table 14.

Summary

The Resource Specialist Role Survey developed as part of this study was distributed to the following educators: (1) one hundred administrators responsible for regular and Resource Specialist Programs at their school sites, (2) one hundred classroom teachers with mainstreamed Resource Specialist students in their classes, and (3) one hundred Resource Specialists who staffed and operated site Resource Specialist Programs. There was a 68 percent total survey return from the three educator groups. Respondents indicated their perceptions of the Resource Specialist role by doing the following: (1) ranking the nine Resource Specialist tasks in order of importance, (2) ranking the relative amount of time spent on each task, and (3) indicating whether the amount of time spent on each task should be increased, decreased or should remain the same.

An analysis of survey responses for the three educator groups indicated the following: (1) there were no significant differences (at the .05 level) in the perceptions of relative task importance, (2) signiticant differences occurred in the perceptions of the amount of time which is spent on three of the nine tasks, and (3) significant differences were found in the perceptions of the amount of time which should be spent on four of the nine Resource Specialist tasks.

A second analysis examining the responses of elementary and

Table 14

Chi-square Calculations of the Perceptions of Site Administrators, Classroom Teachers and Resource Specialists as to the Amount of Time Which Should be Spent on Each Resource Specialist Task

Direct Instruction of Students*

	Administrators Number/Percent	Classroom Teachers Number/Percent	Resource Specialists Number/Percent
Less Time	N=1 1.5%	N=1 2.0%	N=8 10.5%
Same Time	N=41 63.1%	N=24 49.0%	N=33 43.4%
More Time	N=23 35.4%	N=24 49.0%	N=35 46.1%

Chi-square = 10.83 4df significance = 0.028
*significant at the .05 level

Student Assessment

Less Time	N=16 25.0%.	N=9 18.4%	N=10 13.2%
Same Time	N=4 64.1%	N=29 59.2%	N=55 72.4%
More Time	N=7 10.9%	N=11 22.4%	N=11 14.5%

Chi-square = 5.94 4df significance = 0.204

Table 14 (continued)

Resource Specialist Program Management

	Administrators Number/Percent	Classroom Teachers Number/Percent	Resource Specialists Number/Percent
Less Time	N=10 15.4%	N=6 12.2%	N=21 28.4%
Same Time	N=42 64.6%	N=31 63.3%	N=35 47.3%
More Time	N=13 20.0%	N=12 24.5%	N=18 24.3%

Chi-square = 7.39 4df significance = 0.116

Collaborating With Educators

Less Time	N=5 7.7%	N=2 4.1%	N=2 2.7%
Same Time	N=36 55.4%	N=21 42.9%	N=41 54.7%
More Time	N=24 36.9%	N=26 53.1%	N=32 42.7%

Chi-square = 4.64 4df significance = 0.326

Table 14 (continued)

Student Counseling*

	Administrators Number/Percent	Classroom Teachers Number/Percent	Resource Specialists Number/Percent
Less Time	N=4 6.2%	N=3 6.4%	N=7 9.2%
Same Time	N=38 58.5%	N=21 44.7%	N=23 30.3%
More Time	N=23 35.4%	N=23 48.9%	N=46 60.5%

Chi-square = 11.46 4df significance = 0.022
*significant at the .05 level

Collaborating With Parents***

Less Time	N=10 15.4%	N=4 8.2%	N=2 2.7%
Same Time	N=38 58.5%	N=29 59.2%	N=29 39.2%
More Time	N=17 26.2%	N=16 32.7%	N=43 58.1%

Chi-square = 19.65 4df significance = 0.0006
***significant at the .001 level

Table 14 (continued)

Site Special Education Leadership

	Administrators Number/Percent	Classroom Teachers Number/Percent	Resource Specialists Number/Percent
Less Time	N=21 32.3%	N=15 31.3%	N=26 34.2%
Same Time	N=33 50.8%	N=27 56.3%	N=43 56.6%
More Time	N=11 16.9%	N=6 12.5%	N=7 9.2%

Chi=square = 1.98 4df significance 0.739

Collaborating With Others

Less Time	N=12 18.5%	N=6 13.0%	N=5 6.6%
Same Time	N=41 63.1%	N=26 56.5%	N=46 60.5%
More Time	N=12 18.5%	N=14 30.4%	N=25 32.9%

Chi-square = 7.14 4df significance = 0.128

Table 14 (continued)

Change Agent**

	Administrators Number/Percent	Classroom Teachers Number/Percent	Resource Specialists Number/Percent
Less Time	N=6 9.2%	N=7 14.6%	N=2 2.7%
Same Time	N=40 61.5%	N=19 39.6%	N=30 40.5%
More Time	N=19 29.2%	N=22 45,8%	N=42 56.8%

Chi-square = 15.32 4df significance = 0.004

**significant at the ,01 level

secondary educators revealed significant differences in the perceived importance of two of the nine survey tasks, and significant differences in the perceived amount of time spent on four of the nine tasks. The final analysis which examined the responses from Resource Specialists with two years or less experience and those with more than two years experience revealed no significant differences in the perceptions of task importance and only one task with a significant difference in the amount of time perceived spent by the Resource Specialist.

In Chapter 5 the study is summarized, the significant findings are discussed, conclusions based on the findings are drawn and recommendations for further study are presented.

Chapter 5

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter is divided into four sections. In the first section, the purpose, procedures and results of the study are summarized. Section two is a discussion of each task on the Resource Specialist Role Survey. The conclusions drawn from the research are presented in the third section, and the final section contains recommendations for further study.

Summary

The Education for All Handicapped Children Act, Public Law 94-142, required every state to establish programs and procedures to ensure that handicapped youngsters would be educated in the least restrictive environment appropriate for each individual's special needs. For many handicapped students, the least restrictive environment is placement for part of the school day in the regular education program along with non-handicapped students. This practice, commonly called mainstreaming, is often supplemented by concurrent enrollment in a special education resource room program. Dual enrollment of handicapped students in regular and special education programs has grown tremendously since 1975 and has created the need for competent special education teachers who can fill the multi-faceted and often inadequately defined role of the special education resource room teacher.

In California, the special education resource room is called the

Resource Specialist Program. It is the state's primary mainstreaming vehicle and is staffed by a special education teacher designated and certificated as a Resource Specialist. Although the role of the Resource Specialist is addressed in current state law and State Department of Education regulations, there is a good deal of ambiguity and obfuscation evident in this limited description. A clear, realistic role description is needed to give direction for preservice and inservice training as well as for the hiring and evaluation of Resource Specialists.

The literature revealed a number of variations in resource room models and in special education resource teacher roles across the country. The Resource Specialist Role Survey researched and developed for this study defined the role as a composite which included a total of nine tasks grouped according to three basic functions. The three functions and the associated nine tasks are as follows: (1) the direct services to students function, including the tasks of student assessment, student instruction and student counseling, (2) the collaboration/consultation function which includes the tasks of collaborating with parents, with educators, and with other individuals and/or agencies who have knowledge of the student, and (3) the management/leadership function which includes the tasks of managing the Resource Specialist Program, educational leadership at the school site, and various change agent activities such as staff development and parent education.

The purpose of this study was to provide a comprehensive, prioritized description of the Resource Specialist role as perceived by the three groups of educators most directly and consistently involved with mainstreaming handicapped youngsters in Resource Specialist

Programs in California. These groups were: (1) site administrators responsible for both the regular and Resource Specialist Programs in their schools, (2) classroom teachers with at least one Resource Specialist Program student mainstreamed into their classes, and (3) Resource Specialists who operated site Resource Specialist Programs. All educators surveyed were employed in California Master Plan Regions operating pilot Resource Specialist Programs in the spring of 1981.

A carefully selected sample of three hundred educators (one hundred administrators, one hundred classroom teachers and one hundred Resource Specialists) from 52 elementary and 48 secondary schools received copies of the Resource Specialist Role Survey. Each educator was asked to indicate three things. They were: (1) his/her perception of the relative importance of the nine survey tasks, (2) his/her perception of the relative amount of time spent by the Resource Specialist on each task, and (3) his/her perception of whether the time spent on each task should be increased, decreased or should remain the same.

Analysis of the survey data revealed no significant differences at the .05 level in the order of importance of the tasks among administrators, classroom teachers and Resource Specialists. Significant differences in the relative amount of time perceived to be spent on each task were evident, however, among the three educator groups for three of the nine survey tasks. An analysis of the responses indicating whether the amount of time spent on the various tasks should be increased, decreased or remain unchanged also showed significant differences among the three educator groups on four of the nine tasks. Analysis of responses from elementary and secondary educators revealed a significant

difference in their perceptions of task importance and of the time perceived spent on the tasks. Resource Specialists with two years or less experience and with more than two years experience viewed task importance in the same way but differed significantly on their perception of the amount of time spent on special education leadership at the school site.

In the following section each of the nine tasks is presented and discussed in light of the research findings. The tasks are presented in the order of importance, from most to least, according to the combined rankings of all subjects who responded to the Resource Specialist Role Survey. The nine tasks ranked in order of importance are: (1) direct instruction of students, (2) student assessment, (3) Resource Specialist Program management, (4) collaborating with educators, (5) student counseling, (6) collaborating with parents, (7) special education leadership at the school site, (8) change agent, and (9) collaborating with others.

Discussion

1. DIRECT INSTRUCTION OF STUDENTS. Examples include selecting, adapting, developing, preparing and using materials, media, strategies and techniques in cognitive, affective and psycho-motor areas.

There was consensus of perception among the three educator groups, between elementary and secondary educators and between Resource Specialists regardless of years of experience that direct instruction of students was the most important and the most time consuming of all Resource Specialist tasks. However, in spite of all educator groups ranking the task number one in terms of time spent, Resource Specialists

perceived direct instruction as taking significantly more time than did administrators and classroom teachers. Three possible reasons for this discrepancy are discussed below.

First, the discrepancy may result from the fact that Resource Specialist Program students, by law, are to spend the majority of their school day in regular classes. Some classroom teachers and administrators may be unaware that the total instructional program involves 24 to 28 Resource Specialist students requiring a commitment to student contact far beyond that which appears to be so for any given student. The second possible explanation for the difference in perception of time spent on direct instruction has to do with student scheduling. Resource Specialists routinely schedule periods of time without students in order to attend to other tasks. This flexibility of schedule may give the impression that Resource Specialists spend less time in their rooms instructing students than they actually do. The third possible explanation of the different perceptions has to do with the way Resource Specialists interpreted the task of direct student instruction. In reviewing the written comments by Resource Specialists on the survey, five indicated that their aides did a great deal of the actual student instruction. Perhaps others who did not comment ranked the time spent on direct instruction as number one for the same reason as did the Resource Specialist who wrote:

> "Please note that a lot of instructional aide time is spent on Direct Instruction. Therefore, when combining hers and mine both, Direct Instruction is the most important and the most time spent."

A significant difference between the perceptions of administrators and Resource Specialists regarding the amount of time which should

be devoted to direct instruction was evident. Almost two-thirds of the administrators surveyed felt satisfied that the time spent on direct instruction was adequate, while less than half of the Resource Specialists shared that feeling. Written comments by several Resource Specialists indicated frustration at the lack of enough teaching time. One typical comment was, "There is so much paperwork that I often have to make a decision - will I teach or type."

The overall uniformity of perception between and among the various groups on the importance of this task is perhaps due to the fact that direct instruction has long been considered the primary task of teachers and has been the main emphasis of preservice training. Virtually every resource room model and Resource Specialist job description reviewed listed student instruction as a resource teacher task. Direct instruction is also one of the six functions specified in the Resource Specialist Competencies required by California law.

2. STUDENT ASSESSMENT. Examples include student observation; selection, administration and interpretation of tests; diagnosis of strengths and weaknesses.

Site administrators, classroom teachers and Resource Specialists regardless of experience perceived student assessment as the second most important Resource Specialist task. These groups also concurred that the second largest amount of time spent by the Resource Specialist was on student assessment. Elementary and secondary educators agreed on the importance of student assessment, but those at the elementary level perceived significantly more Resource Specialist time spent assessing students than did secondary educators.

A possible explanation for this difference may be that more time

is actually spent assessing students at the elementary level, since this is when most handicapped students are initially identified. These findings agree with the literature which suggests that student assessment is a major task of resource room teachers.

It is interesting to note that while there was an amazingly high rate of agreement about the importance and the amount of time allocated to the student assessment task among the various groups of educators, all of whom had first hand experience with state funded pilot Resource Specialist Programs, California law outlining what the Resource Specialist Program shall provide does not mention student assessment. The Title 5 Regulations do include in the definition of Resource Specialist services that of "assessing pupil progress on a regular basis..." However, in the Title 5 Regulation which specify the six functions and 31 performance competencies for the Resource Specialist Certificate of Competence, there is no assessment function listed, nor is there even one specific competency related to proficiency in the actual assessment of student. There are, however, competencies for consulting with classroom teachers about the assessment of students and the utilization of evaluation data. There are also competencies for coordinating assessment procedures and for providing staff development in the area of assessment. There are even competencies for providing parents with knowledge of assessment instruments, procedures and results; however, nowhere is it specified that Resource Specialists demonstrate competency in the actual assessment of students.

3. RESOURCE SPECIALIST PROGRAM MANAGEMENT. Examples include developing, organizing, supervising and maintaining a quality program along with developing, implementing and reviewing each assigned student's Individualized Education Program (IEP).

This task was the only one on the Resource Specialist Role Survey for which no significant differences of perception were found in any analyses of data. Resource Specialist Program management was ranked the third most important task by all groups. There were no appreciable differences in the perceptions of the educators who saw the task as taking the third most amount of time and who felt that the time allocation was appropriate, not needing to be increased or decreased.

Program management was mentioned often in the literature as an appropriate role responsibility for the resource teacher. In addition, management activities are specified in state law and in the Title 5 Regulations.

4. COLLABORATING WITH EDUCATORS. Examples include communicating, consulting and conferencing with administrators, teachers, support personnel, paraprofessionals about scheduling, curriculum, instruction, behavior, proficiencies, graduation credits.

Administrators and Resource Specialists perceived this task as essentially the same in terms of importance and time spent, assigning to both the rank of fourth of the nine tasks. However, classroom teachers perceived this task as more important (ranked third) and as having less Resource Specialist time spent on it (ranked fifth). This discrepancy may indicate that regular teachers with mainstreamed students in their classes would like the Resource Specialist to spend more time working with them. This sentiment was expressed by several classroom teachers who responded to the survey. Typical of the written comments were these three: (1) "Definite need for more specialist know how shared with classroom teachers", (2) "Needs to be a stronger coordination between classroom and RSP", and (3) "What the child does in RSP should directly

improve his classroom work". The literature reviewed indicated that even when classroom teachers are satisfied with mainstreaming, they express the need for more collaboration time with the special education resource teacher, a perception which the findings of this study support.

The only area of significant difference of perception for any educator groups with regard to this task was between those at elementary and secondary levels. Elementary administrators, classroom teachers and Resource Specialists perceived significantly more time being spent collaborating with educators than did secondary educators. This perception may be due to the differences in program structure and staff size at the two levels. Generally at the elementary level each mainstreamed student is in a self-contained regular classroom with only one classroom teacher. Secondary students, however, may be mainstreamed with as many as five different teachers. Since a Resource Specialist case load may run as high as 28 students, there are many more secondary classroom teachers for a Resource Specialist to see and work with than there are at the elementary level. Because of the larger number of teachers to collaborate with at the secondary level, any given classroom teacher may receive proportionally less of the Resource Specialist time allocated for collaboration than would an elementary classroom teacher.

Another possible reason for the fact that elementary educators perceive more Resource Specialist time spent collaborating with educators than do those at the secondary level may be because less time is indeed spent on that task at secondary sites. Secondary Resource Specialist students are more rigidly scheduled for specific class periods than are elementary students who may be pulled out at various times from self-contained classrooms. Secondary Resource Specialists may

also have only one scheduled period free of students to collaborate with a larger number of teachers. Elementary Resource Specialists, on the other hand, generally deal with fewer classroom teachers and often consult with them at lunch, recess, and in their classrooms at various times during the day on a more flexible basis. The inherent problems generated by a larger campus, more teachers, staggered prep and lunch periods, and movement of classroom teachers from room to room during the day may directly contribute to the fact that less time is spent by secondary Resource Specialists collaborating with classroom teachers.

5. STUDENT COUNSELING. Examples include group and/or individual work in career/vocational, personal, interpersonal, social and self-esteem areas.

This Resource Specialist task was ranked fifth out of the nine tasks in terms of importance and of the relative amount of time spent on the task. The slight differences in the rankings of the three educator groups and between Resource Specialists with two years or less experience and those with more than two years experience were not significant. When elementary and secondary educators' perceptions as to task importance and time spent on student counseling were compared, however, significant differences were evident. Secondary administrators, classroom teachers and Resource Specialists perceived student counseling as significantly more important and as utilizing significantly more Resource Specialist time than did educators at the elementary level. There are several possible reasons which may account for these differences.

As noted in Chapter 2, some research studies have indicated that social, emotional, personal and interpersonal problems are frequently

evident in special education students. Obviously, adolescents with these kinds of problems are often more difficult to handle than are younger children with the same problems. Adolescents are physically larger, have lived more years with their problems and have often developed more complex defense mechanisms to cope with them. Because counseling personnel and school psychologists are often in short supply, secondary Resource Specialists frequently find themselves working with students on non-academic problems as well as on academic ones. Additionally, secondary Resource Specialists often take the place of academic and vocational counselors by assisting their students with counseling related to career/vocational decisions, graduation and proficiency requirements, scheduling and other issues relevant at the secondary level but not at the elementary level.

The third area marked by significant differences of perception is between Resource Specialists and site administrators regarding the amount of time which should be spent by the Resource Specialist on student counseling. Almost 60 percent of the site administrators surveyed believed the time spent counseling students should remain the same while over 60 percent of the Resource Specialists thought the time allocated to the task should be increased. This difference may be explained by the different perspectives of the two groups of educators. Site administrators, because of their more global view, may perceive other school personnel as being responsible for counseling students. Administrators could perceive, therefore, that there is not as much need for the Resource Specialist to carry out this task. Resource Specialists, on the other hand, according to the literature and to personal interviews, often do the vocational, academic and personal counseling

of their students because other school counseling personnel are utilized in these areas to deal with the majority of the student population who are not in the Resource Specialist Programs. Because Resource Specialist students are with the Resource Specialist less than half of their school day, finding the time to do counseling along with academic and other remediation is very difficult. Thus Resource Specialists may perceive that more time should be allocated for student counseling. Student counseling does not appear on the list of Resource Specialist competencies or in the Resource Specialist role as described in California law.

6. COLLABORATING WITH PARENTS. Examples include communicating, consulting and conferencing about home/school support, student needs, programs, services, resources.

There was agreement about the relative importance of this task among educators from the three groups, between elementary and secondary educators and between Resource Specialists with two years experience or less and those with more than two years experience. General agreement was also found on the amount of time perceived to be spent on the task except between Resource Specialists and classroom teachers. The latter perceived the Resource Specialist as spending significantly more time collaborating with parents than did Resource Specialists themselves. This could be due to the fact that every student's Individualized Education Program (IEP) is required by law to be developed with joint input from the parent and educators. Indeed, parental involvement and informed parental consent must be obtained at several stages throughout the entire IEP process. Since Resource Specialists obviously must try to involve parents on many occasions, classroom teachers may view these

contacts as much more time consuming than do Resource Specialists. This idea is further substantiated when looking at the amount of time classroom teachers and Resource Specialists feel should be spent collaborating with parents. Almost 60 percent of the classroom teachers felt the time spent collaborating with parents should remain the same, for they perceived it to be quite high already. Somewhat less than 33 percent of the teachers felt more time should be given to the task. Resource Specialists, who perceived less time than classroom teachers did as being spent collaborating with parents, reversed the percentages. Slightly more than 58 percent wanted more time for collaboration with parents while slightly more than 39 percent suggested the time should remain the same. Federal and state laws and regulations clearly designate working with parents of the handicapped as a high priority item. For example, one of the six Resource Specialist functions identified in the Title 5 Regulations deals specifically with parent education, and there are six specific competencies listed for that function. Interestingly, collaboration with parents was ranked relatively low (six out of nine tasks) in terms of importance and time spent by all three educator groups. There appears to be a discrepancy between what educators working with the pilot Resource Specialist Programs saw as important and what state law and regulation prioritize as important.

7. SITE SPECIAL EDUCATION LEADERSHIP. Examples include coordinating the school site special education referral process, scheduling IEP meetings, monitoring time lines and legal compliance issues.

This task was ranked low (seventh out of nine) in terms of importance and in terms of the time spent on the task by all three

educator groups. The slight differences in scores among the groups and between elementary and secondary educators were no more than could be attributed to chance. When comparing the perceptions of Resource Specialists with two years experience or less to those with more than two years experience, however, significant differences were evident in the relative amount of time spent on special education leadership at the school site. Those Resource Specialists with less role experience perceived site leadership as taking significantly more time than did Resource Specialists with more experience. This task was the only one on which Resource Specialists differed significantly in their perceptions based on their years of experience.

This difference could be due to the fact that many new Resource Specialists do spend more time on site special education leadership duties. Much time is needed to become knowledgeable about the various special education laws, regulations and compliance issues and to facilitate their dissemination. Experience may well help Resource Specialists develop short cuts and to do the same things in less time. Half or more of the educators in all three groups indicated that the amount of time spent on leadership at the school site should remain the same. Generally, this task appears to be one of the low priority tasks utilizing relatively little Resource Specialist time once the Resource Specialist is experienced and established in the role.

8. CHANGE AGENT. Examples include promoting awareness, understanding and acceptance of handicapped individuals, mainstreaming and the Resource Specialist Program, as well as assisting with staff development and parent education related to special education.

This task was one of two which did not receive equal rankings for importance and time spent when the responses of all educator groups

were analyzed. Site administrators, classroom teachers and Resource Specialists as a group ranked the task eighth in importance but ninth in terms of the amount of time spent on it by the Resource Specialist. While there were slight variations in the rankings of the three groups separately and in those of Resource Specialists with varying amounts of experience, none were significant. Significant differences, however, were noted between elementary and secondary educators who ranked this task. Secondary educators perceived the change agent task as significantly more important and as taking significantly more Resource Specialist time than did elementary educators.

One explanation for this difference may be that mainstreaming at the secondary level is reported in the literature and in the field to be generally more difficult than at the elementary level. Elementary educators are often called "student oriented" while those at the secondary level are often called "content oriented". Since students frequently need the course content and teaching approach modified because all of the regular course standards cannot be met by the student, mainstreaming a student into one class with one teacher would be much easier than mainstreaming him or her into five classes with five different teachers. In order to make mainstreaming more effective, inservice, staff development and awareness activities are needed. Secondary educators may realize their need more than do those at the elementary level because mainstreaming at the secondary level has been reported to be less successful than at the elementary level.

When the three educator groups indicated whether the amount of time spent on change agent activities should be more, less or the same, significant differences in their responses occurred. Almost 57 percent

of all Resource Specialists surveyed felt the task time should be increased, while only 29 percent of the administrators felt the same way. This may be because Resource Specialists are closer to and, therefore, more aware than administrators are of mainstreaming problems and the need for increased understanding and skills on the part of regular educators to deal successfully with mainstreamed students.

Staff development and inservice education is one of the six major Resource Specialist functions identified in California's Title 5 Regulations. The fact that this task was ranked next to the last in order of importance and last in terms of time spent may indicate an area which needs to be examined more closely. Apparently educators experienced with pilot Resource Specialist Programs spend less time and see this task as less important than did the individuals who established the legal framework for Resource Specialists.

9. COLLABORATING WITH OTHERS. Examples include communicating and consulting with Social Service Agencies, Vocational and Regional Centers, physicians and therapists to collect and/or report student needs, programs, information.

Collaborating with others was ranked as the least important of all Resource Specialist tasks by site administrators, classroom teachers and Resource Specialists. There were significant differences in the way all three educator groups perceived the relative amount of time spent by the Resource Specialist collaborating with others. Of the three groups, classroom teachers perceived the most amount of time spent on the task (ranked seventh out of nine tasks), Resource Specialists perceived the least amount of time spent (ranked ninth) while administrators' perceptions fell between those of the other two groups (ranked eighth). These differences may be explained by the fact that, while it is generally the

Resource Specialist who shares information and input from outside agencies and individuals with other school personnel, it may not always be the Resource Specialist who spends the time gathering that information. Often other site team members or other special education personnel will collect and transmit pertinent information about Resource Specialist Program students to the Resource Specialist. This suggests that less Resource Specialist time may be spent on this task than is readily observable by administrators and classroom teachers.

Elementary educators perceived collaboration with others as the least important of all nine Resource Specialist tasks. They also perceived the time spent on this task to be the second lowest amount. Secondary educators and Resource Specialists regardless of years of experience did not differ significantly from the views of elementary educators. Administrators, classroom teachers and Resource Specialists did not differ in any significant way in their perceptions of how much time should be spent collaborating with others. Well over half of the educators in each group believed the time spent should remain the same for this least important of all Resource Specialist tasks.

Conclusions

The following conclusions were drawn from the survey data:

1. Site administrators, classroom teachers and Resource Specialists demonstrated a high level of agreement in prioritizing the relative importance of the nine tasks which make up the Resource Specialist role. For one-third of the tasks, all educator groups assigned identical rankings. For the remaining two-thirds, only slight variations were noted among the three educator groups.

2. There was agreement among site administrators, classroom teachers and Resource Specialists regarding the relative amount of time perceived to be spent on each Resource Specialist task. For three of the tasks, all educator groups assigned the same ranking with some variation occurring in the rankings of the other six tasks.

3. There were no significant differences in the perceptions of administrators, classroom teachers and Resource Specialists regarding the relative importance of the tasks which make up the Resource Specialist role.

4. There were significant differences in the perceptions of administrators, classroom teachers and Resource Specialists regarding the amount of time spent by the Resource Specialist on three of the nine tasks which make up the Resource Specialist role. These tasks were direct instruction, collaborating with parents and collaborating with others. Resource Specialists perceived direct instruction as more time consuming than did administrators and classroom teachers. Classroom teachers perceived collaborating with parents as taking more Resource Specialist time than did administrators and Resource Specialists. Site administrators perceived more Resource Specialist time spent collaborating with others than did classroom teachers and Resource Specialists.

5. There were significant differences in the perceptions of site administrators, classroom teachers and Resource Specialists regarding the amount of time which should be spent by the Resource Specialist on four of the nine tasks which make up the Resource Specialist role. These tasks were direct instruction, student counseling, collaborating with parents and change agent. Almost two-thirds of the administrators surveyed believed the amount of direct instruction

time spent was adequate, while less than half of the Resource Specialists and classroom teachers shared that view. Twice the number of administrators perceived that the time spent counseling students should remain the same than did Resource Specialists. More than twice as many Resource Specialists perceived more time needed for collaboration with parents than did classroom teachers. More than twice as many Resource Specialists perceived the need for more time to be spent on the change agent task than did site administrators.

6. There were significant differences in the perceptions of elementary and secondary educators regarding the relative importance of two of the nine Resource Specialist tasks. These tasks were student counseling and change agent. Secondary educators perceived both tasks as being more important than did elementary educators.

7. There were significant differences in the perceptions of elementary and secondary educators regarding the amount of time spent by the Resource Specialist on four of the nine tasks which make up the Resource Specialist role. These tasks were student assessment, student counseling, collaborating with educators and change agent. Secondary educators perceived student counseling and the change agent task as more time consuming than did elementary educators. Those at the elementary level perceived student assessment and collaboration with educators as utilizing more time than did secondary educators.

8. There were no significant differences in the perceptions of Resource Specialists with two years or less experience and those with more than two years experience regarding the relative importance of the nine tasks which make up the Resource Specialist role.

9. There was a significant difference in the perceptions of

Resource Specialists with two years or less experience and those with more than two years experience regarding the amount of time spent on one of the nine tasks which make up the Resource Specialist role. Less experienced Resource Specialists perceived more time devoted to special education leadership at the school site than did Resource Specialists with more experience.

Since there were no significant differences in the way site administrators, classroom teachers and Resource Specialists prioritized the relative importance of the nine tasks on the Resource Specialist Role Survey, and since no additional tasks of major importance were identified by survey respondents as part of the Resource Specialist role, it is suggested that this study has resulted in a comprehensive, prioritized description of the Resource Specialist role. The nine tasks which make up the role are in order of importance, as follows: (1) direct instruction of students, (2) student assessment, (3) Resource Specialist Program management, (4) collaborating with educators, (5) student counseling, (6) collaborating with parents, (7) site special education leadership, (8) change agent, and (9) collaborating with others.

Prior to the institutionalization of this role, educators should consider the significant differences which exist in the perceptions of elementary and secondary educators regarding the relative importance of several Resource Specialist tasks. The tasks of student counseling and change agent were viewed as significantly more important by secondary educators than by those at the elementary level. These differences suggest that it may be reasonable to have two differently prioritized Resource Specialist role descriptions - one for elementary and one for

secondary Resource Specialists. Support for such a suggestion has been expressed in the literature and by educators in the field. Further exploration of this possibility is certainly warranted.

A number of statistically significant differences occurred in the perceptions of the various educator groups regarding the amount of time which is and which should be spent by the Resource Specialist on the tasks which make up the Resource Specialist role. These differences could easily contribute to diverse expectations for the Resource Specialist on the part of administrators, classroom teachers and Resource Specialists at both elementary and secondary levels.

The Resource Specialist position is a critical one in California's Master Plan for Special Education. As the special educator most directly involved in mainstreaming handicapped students into the regular education program, the Resource Specialist has a multi-faceted job requiring diverse skills and duties. Without a realistic, comprehensive, prioritized description of the Resource Specialist role, uncertainty, ambiguity and conflicting role expectations could easily occur, thus jeopardizing the success of the mainstreaming effort. Institutions of higher education are presently developing Resource Specialist training and credentialing programs. To make these programs effective, professors of special education must know precisely what the Resource Specialist role entails so that content and competencies can be developed which equip Resource Specialists to meet the demands of their multi-faceted role. In addition, by September, 1982, all California school districts must have Resource Specialist Programs available for qualifying handicapped students. This short time line makes it imperative that school district personnel involved in the

hiring and evaluation of Resource Specialists have knowledge of what the Resource Specialist role actually is in order to staff Resource Specialist Programs with those individuals who can truly facilitate the mainstreaming effort. It is hoped that this study has helped clarify the Resource Specialist role which in turn will give direction to those individuals involved with training, credentialing, hiring and evaluating Resource Specialists.

Recommendations for Further Study

In light of the findings of this study, the following recommendations for further study are made.

1. A study to determine more specifically the differences in the roles of elementary and secondary Resource Specialists could provide information helpful in determining whether preservice training and credentialing should remain undifferentiated at the K-12 level or whether enough differences exist to warrant unique training programs and/or credentials.

2. A study is recommended which would incorporate perceptions of the time spent on the Resource Specialist tasks along with direct observations. This subjective and objective combination could provide a more accurate assessment of Resource Specialist time utilization.

3. A follow-up study is recommended to ascertain the rationale behind and reasons for ranking the Resource Specialist tasks in their order of importance.

4. A study to develop specific competencies in the area of direct instruction would provide useful and meaningful guidelines for credentialing, preservice and inservice training, as well as hiring

and evaluation of Resource Specialists. No such competencies are presently included in California's Title 5 Regulations governing Resource Specialist certification.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Best, John W. Research in Education. 2d ed. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1970.

Cohen, Shirley. Special People: A Brighter Future for Everyone with Physical, Mental and Emotional Disabilities. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1977.

Cruickshank, William M. Learning Disabilities in Home, School and Community. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1977.

Downs-Taylor, Carol and Eleanor M. Landon. Collaboration in Special Education: Parents, Teachers and the IEP. Belmont: Fearon Division, Pitman Learning, 1981.

Ehlers, Walter H., Curtis H. Krishef, and Jon C. Prothero. An Introduction to Mental Retardation: A Programmed Text. 2d ed. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, 1977.

Frost, S. E., Jr., and Kenneth P. Bailey. Historical and Philosophical Foundations of Western Education. 2d ed. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, 1973.

Gearheart, Bill R. Learning Disabilities. 2d ed. St. Louis: C. V. Mosby, 1977.

_____. Teaching the Learning Disabled. St. Louis: C. V. Mosby, 1976.

Goffman, Erving. Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity. Englewood Cliffs: Printice-Hall, 1963.

Good, Thomas L., and Jere E. Brophy. Looking in Classrooms. New York: Harper & Row, 1973.

Harding, Norris G., ed. Behavior of Exceptional Children. 2d ed. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, 1978.

Hawisher, Margaret F., and Mary L. Calhoun. The Resource Teacher: An Educational Asset for Children with Special Needs. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, 1978.

Hopkins, Kenneth D., and Gene V. Glass. Basic Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1978.

Jones, Reginald L., ed. Problems and Issues in the Education of Exceptional Children. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1971.

Kauffman, James M., and James S. Payne. Mental Retardation: Introduction and Personel Perspectives. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, 1975.

Kirk, Samuel A. Educating Exceptional Children. 2d ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1972.

Lerner, Janet W. Children With Learning Disabilities. 2d ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1976.

Long, Kate. "Johnny's Such a Bright Boy, What a Shame He's Retarded". Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1977.

Lowenbraun, Sheila, and James Q. Affleck, eds. Teaching Mildly Handicapped Children in Regular Classes. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, 1976.

MacMillan, Donald L. Mental Retardation in School and Society. Boston: Little, Brown, 1977.

McCarthy, James J., and Joan F. McCarthy. Learning Disabilities. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1969.

Mercer, Cecil D. Children and Adolescents with Learning Disabilities. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, 1979.

Meyen, Edward L., Glenn A. Vergason, and Richard J. Whelan. Alternatives for Teaching Exceptional Children. Denver: Love Publishing, 1975.

Osman, Betty B. Learning Disabilities: A Family Affair. New York: Random House, 1979.

Paul, James L., Ann P. Turnbull and William Cruickshank. Mainstreaming: A Practical Guide. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1977.

Read, Donald A., and Sidney B. Simon, eds. Humanistic Education Sourcebook. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1975.

Roberts, Joseph and Bonnie Hawk. Legal Rights Primer for the Handicapped: In and Out of the Classroom. Novato: Academic Therapy, 1980.

Samples, Bob. The Metaphoric Mind: A Celebration of Creative Consciousness. Reading: Addison-Wesley, 1976.

_____, Cheryl Charles, and Dick Barnhart. Wholeschool Book: Teaching and Learning Late in the 20th Century. Reading: Addison-Wesley, 1977.

Sax, Gilbert. Foundations of Educational Research. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1979.

Smith, Jay M., and Don-David Lusterman. The Teacher as Learning Facilitator: Psychology and the Educational Process. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing, 1979.

Sudman, Seymore. Applied Sampling. New York: Academic Press, 1976.

Valett, Robert E. Humanistic Education: Developing the Total Person. St. Louis: C. V. Mosby, 1977.

Wallace, Gerald, and James M. Kauffman. Teaching Children with Learning Problems. 2d ed. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, 1978.

_____, and James A. McLoughlin. Learning Disabilities: Concepts and Characteristics. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, 1975.

Wiederholt, J. Lee, Donald D. Hammill, and Virginia Brown. The Resource Teacher: A Guide to Effective Practices. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1978.

Periodicals

Aiello, Barbara. "Especially for Special Educators: A Sense of Our Own History." Exceptional Children, 42 (February, 1976), 244-52.

Algozzine, Bob, Cecil Mercer, and Terry Countermine. "The Effects of Labels and Behavior on Teacher Expectations." Exceptional Children, 44 (October, 1977), 131-32.

Belch, Peter J. "Toward Noncategorical Teacher Certification in Special Education-Myth or Reality?" Exceptional Children, 46 (October, 1979), 129-31.

Bensky, Jeffery M., et al. "Public Law 94-142 and Stress: A Problem for Educators." Exceptional Children, 47 (September, 1980), 24-29.

Blackhurst, A Edward. "Noncategorical Teacher Preparation: Problems and Promises." Exceptional Children, 48 (November, 1981), 197-205.

Cheyney, Wendy, and Stephen S. Strichart. "A Learning Stations Model for the Resource Room." Academic Therapy, 16 (January, 1981), 271-79.

Cohen, Shirley. "Improving Attitudes Toward the Handicapped." Educational Forum, 42 (November, 1977), 9-20.

Connor, Frances P. "The Past is Prologue: Teacher Preparation in Special Education." Exceptional Children, 42 (April, 1976), 366-80.

Council for Exceptional Children. "The Preparation of Special Education Personnel." Yearbook of Special Education, 4 (1978-79), 583-617.

D'Alonzo, Bruno J., Rosemarie L. D'Alonzo, and August J. Mauser. "Developing Resource Rooms for the Handicapped." Teaching Exceptional Children, 11 (Spring, 1979), 91-96.

Dunn, Lloyd H. "Special Education for the Mildly Retarded--Is Much of it Justified?" Exceptional Children, 35 (May, 1968), 5-22.

Dykes, Mary Kay. "Competency Needs of Special Educators of Crippled and Other Health Impaired Children." Journal of Special Education, 9 (Winter, 1975), 367-74.

Foley, James. "Effects of Labeling and Teacher Behavior on Children's Attitudes." American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 83 (January, 1979), 380-84.

Garguilo, Richard M., and Fred L. Pigge. "Perceived Competencies of Elementary and Special Education Teachers." Journal of Educational Research, (July, August, 1979), 339-43.

Garrison, Lloyd. "Are You Ready for Mainstreaming?" Business Education Forum, 32 (January, 1978), 9-10.

Gibbons, Spenser. "PL 94-142: An Impetus for Consultation." The School Psychology Digest, 7 (Summer, 1978), 18-25.

Gickling, Edward E., Lee C. Murphy, and Douglas W. Mallory. "Teachers' Preferences for Resource Services." Exceptional Children, 45 (March, 1979), 442-49.

Guerin, Gilbert R., and Kathleen Scatlocky. "Integration Programs for the Mildly Handicapped." Exceptional Children, 41 (November, 1974), 173-79.

Hartman, Robert K., and Joyce A. Hartman. "The Two-Directional Resource Room: Report on a Pilot Project." Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, 11 (December, 1976), 296-303.

Hendrickson, Barbara. "Teachers Make Mainstreaming Work." Learning, 7 (October, 1978), 104-20.

Hoben, Mollie. "Toward Integration in the Mainstream." Exceptional Children, 47 (October, 1980), 100-05.

Idol-Maestas, Lorna, Sandy, Lloyd, and M. Stephen Lilly. "A Noncategorical Approach to Direct Service and Teacher Education." Exceptional Children, 48 (November, 1981), 213-20.

Ito, H. Richard. "After the Resource Room-Then What?" Academic Therapy, 16 (January, 1981), 283-87.

Johnson, David W., and Roger T. Johnson. "Integrating Handicapped Students into the Mainstream." Exceptional Children, 47 (October, 1980), 90-98.

Johnson, G. Orville. "Special Education for the Mentally Handicapped--A Paradox." Exceptional Children, 29 (September, 1962), 62-69.

_____, and Samuel A. Kirk. "Are Mentally Handicapped Children Segregated in the Regular Grades?" Exceptional Children, 17 (June, 1950), 65-8 and 87-8.

Jones, Reginald L., et al. "Evaluating Mainstreaming Programs: Models, Caveats, Considerations and Guidelines." Exceptional Children, 44 (May, 1978), 588-601.

Kameen, Marilyn C. "Creating Least Restrictive Environments for Handicapped Children." Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 13 (February, 1979), 150-228.

Klein, Jennie. "Teaching the Special Child in Regular Classrooms." Yearbook of Special Education, 4 (1978-79), 145-51.

Larsen, Steven C. "Problem Learners: Environment Tells the Tale." Reach, 1 (November-December, 1978), 10-17.

Lerner, Janet W. "Symposium No. 11--Remedial Reading and Learning Disabilities: Are They the Same or Different?" Journal of Special Education, 9 (Summer, 1975), 117-181.

_____, Mary Ann Evans, and Gertrude Meyers. "Learning Disabilities Programs at the Secondary Level: A Survey." Yearbook of Special Education, 4 (1978-79), 401-11.

Little, Thomas. "Training Special Education Support Personnel." Teacher Education, 13 (Autumn, 1977), 23-27.

Martin, Marilyn J. "Mainstreaming and Teaching in the Public High School." The English Journal, 69 (April, 1980), 9-11.

Meisels, Samuel J. "First Steps in Mainstreaming." Young Children, 33 (November, 1977), 4-13.

Middleton, Ernest J., Catherine Morsink, and Sheila Cohen. "Program Graduates' Perception of Need for Training in Mainstreaming." Exceptional Children, 45 (January, 1979), 256-61.

Miller, Sidney R., David A. Sabatino, and Roger P. Larsen. "Issues in the Professional Preparation of Secondary School Special Education." Exceptional Children, 46 (February, 1980), 344-50.

_____, Robert Stoneburner, and Ted L. Miller. "Moving the University to Student: A Model for Special Education Training." Educational Horizons, 58 (Winter, 1979), 123-26.

Miller, Ted L., and David A. Sabatino. "An Evaluation of the Teacher Consultant Model as an Approach to Mainstreaming." Exceptional Children, 45 (October, 1978), 86-91.

_____, and Harvey N. Switzky. "The Least Restrictive Alternative: Implications for Service Providers." Journal of Special Education, 12 (Summer, 1978), 123-31.

Miltenberger, Jerry. "Mainstreaming--A Different Approach." Education Unlimited, 1 (October, 1979), 51-53.

Montgomery, Mark. "The Special Educator as Consultant: Some Strategies." Teaching Exceptional Children, 10 (Summer, 1978), 109-12.

Moore, Judy, and Marvin Fine. "Regular and Special Class Teachers' Perceptions of Normal and Exceptional Students and Their Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming." Psychology in the Schools, 15 (April, 1978), 253-59.

Nadler, Barbara, Myrna Merron, and William K. Friedel. "PL 94-142: One Response to the Personnel Development Mandate." Exceptional Children, 47 (March, 1981), 463-64.

Nowrey, James E. "A Brief Synopsis of Mental Deficiency." American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 49 (September, 1945), 341-45.

Osternig, Louis R., and James P. Santomier. "PL 94-142: Implications for Professional Preparation." The Physical Educator, 35 (May, 1978), 75-77.

Powers, David A. "Secondary School Mainstreaming of the Educable Mentally Retarded." The Education Digest, 45 (March, 1980), 46-49.

Preston, J. B., ed. "The Secondary LD Student." Academic Therapy, 13 (September, 1977), 5-128.

Reynolds, Maynard C. "A Framework for Considering Some Issues in Special Education." Exceptional Children, 28 (June, 1962), 367-70.

_____. "Education of Handicapped Students: Some Areas of Confusion." Phi Delta Kappan, 61 (May, 1980), 603-4.

Ringlaben, Ravic P., and Jay R. Price. "Regular Class Teachers' Perceptions of Mainstreaming Effects." Exceptional Children, 47 (January, 1981), 302-04.

Roberson, Julius B. "Pre-Service Changes in Teacher Education Related to Mainstreaming." Yearbook of Special Education, 6 (1980-81), 387-90.

Robinson, Edward H., and Marguerite C. Brosh. "Communication Skills Training for Regular Teachers." Journal of Learning Disabilities, 13 (March, 1980), 162-65.

Robson, Donald L. "Administering Educational Services for the Handicapped: Role Expectations and Perceptions." Exceptional Children, 47 (February, 1981), 377-78.

Roubinek, Darrell. "Will Mainstreaming Fit?" Educational Leadership, 35 (February, 1978), 410-14.

Rude, Carolyn, R. "Trends and Priorities in In-Service Training." Exceptional Children, 45 (November, 1978), 172-79.

Sabatino, David A. "An Evaluation of Resource Rooms for Children with Learning Disabilities." Journal of Learning Disabilities, 4 (February, 1971), 84-93.

_____. "Resource Rooms: The Renaissance in Special Education." The Journal of Special Education, 6 (May, 1972), 335-47.

Sargent, Laurence. "Resource Teacher Time Utilization: An Observational Study." Exceptional Children, 47 (March, 1981), 420-25.

Sawyer, Walter E., and Bonnie A. Wilson. "Role Clarification for Remedial Reading and Learning Disabilities Teachers." The Reading Teacher, 33 (November, 1979), 162-66.

Schultz, Jane B. "Facing the Label." Education Unlimited, 1 (October, 1979), 50-52.

Shattuck, Marquis. "Segregation versus Non-Segregation of Exceptional Children." Journal of Special Education, 12 (Spring, 1978), 17-28.

Swart, Richard. "A Secondary School Resource Room Makes Mainstreaming Work." Teaching Exceptional Children, 11 (Winter, 1979), 77-79.

Thurman, S. Kenneth, and Michael Lewis. "Children's Response to Differences: Some Possible Implications for Mainstreaming." Exceptional Children, 45 (March, 1979), 468-70.

Vance, Hubert R. "Thoughts on the Learning Disabilities Teacher." Academic Therapy, 14 (January, 1979), 279-86.

Wiederholt, Lee J. "Planning Resource Rooms for the Mildly Handicapped." Focus on Exceptional Children, 10 (January, 1974), 6-11.

Zemanek, Donald H., and Barry E. Lehrer. "The Role of University Departments of Special Education in Mainstreaming." Exceptional Children, 43 (March, 1977), 377-79.

Zettel, Jeffery J. "The Evolution of the Least Restrictive Environment Concept in Law." Journal of Education, 161 (Summer, 1979), 63-80.

Zettel, Jeffery J., and Joseph Ballard. "The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, PL 94-142: It's History, Origins, and Concepts." Journal of Education, 161 (Summer, 1979), 5-22.

Other Sources

California. Administrative Code. Title 5 Regulations, Part 30, Special Education Programs. (1981).

California. Education Code. Part 30, Special Education Programs. (1981).

California Public Schools Directory. Sacramento: Government Printing Office, 1980.

Sowers, Ganelda. "Observations of a Primary School Principal After Four Years of Experience with Mainstreaming." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, Ontario, March, 1978.

Stulac, Joseph, and John Olive, eds. "Special Education Competencies for Teachers. Atlanta: Georgia State Department of Education, 1979.

U. S. District Court for the Northern District of California. Larry P. v. Wilson Riles. Opinion (October, 1979), 1-131.

U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Federal Register. (August, 1977).

U. S. Supreme Court. Brown v. Board of Education. 347 U, S. 483, 493 (1954).

U. S. Supreme Court. Lau v. Nichols. 414 U. S. 563, 94 S. Ct. 786 39 L.Ed, 2d 1 (Cal., 1974).

U. S. Supreme Court. Mills v. Board of Education. 348 F. Supp. 866 (D. C., 1972).

U. S. Supreme Court. Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children v. Pennsylvania. 343 F. Supp. 279 (E. D. Pa., 1972).

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

The following letter was mailed to each site administrator along with three copies of the Resource Specialist Role Survey, three pre-addressed, stamped reply envelopes and a response post card.

NEWARK UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

5715 Musick Avenue • P. O. Box 385
Newark, California 94560
Area Code 415 • 797-2141

SUPERINTENDENT
EVELYN B. KIPP

ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENTS
ORTON W. BENSON, JR.
LYLE M. KINGERY, ED.D.

May 6, 1981

Dear

I am writing to request your assistance with a research project in the area of special education. The project is under the auspices of the University of the Pacific, School of Education and is concerned with the role of the Resource Specialist. Because your school is in a California Master Plan Region, you and your staff have a valuable and unique perspective which needs to be shared with other educators as they plan and implement mainstreaming programs.

Enclosed are three (3) copies of a Resource Specialist Role Survey. Please complete one of the surveys yourself and distribute the other copies to one (1) Resource Specialist and one (1) classroom teacher who has students in the Resource Specialist Program. The survey will take only a few minutes to fill out and all responses will be confidential.

Your cooperation and assistance in completing the survey and encouraging your teachers to do the same is much appreciated. Only a few key people are being asked to participate in this project, and input from you and your staff is critical to its success. Thank you in advance for your help.

Sincerely,

Eleanor M. Landon
Director of Pupil Personnel

EL:cj

P.S. Please put the names of the staff members to whom you have given the survey on the attached post card and drop it in the mail. Thank you.

APPENDIX B

RESOURCE SPECIALIST ROLE SURVEY

Please identify and describe any important Resource Specialist role not included in the survey.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Please add any additional comment you wish to make.

_____

_____

_____

_____

If you would like a summary of the results of this study, please write your name and address below.

_____
Name

_____
Address

_____
City Zip

A Penny for Your Thoughts

This survey is part of a study of the role of the Resource Specialist as viewed by Resource Specialists, site administrators and classroom teachers who work with mainstreamed, handicapped students. You, as one of these key educators directly affected by the Resource Specialist Program, can make an important contribution to understanding how the Resource Specialist role is presently perceived.

Please take a few minutes to complete this survey. Your response will be confidential and used only in combination with other responses from throughout the state. An addressed, stamped reply envelope is attached for your convenience.

Thank you for your valuable assistance.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. **Present Position**

___ Site Administrator
___ Classroom Teacher
___ Resource Specialist

2. **Year in Present Position**

___ First
___ Second
___ Third
___ Fourth
___ Fifth
___ Sixth or More

3. **Year at Present Site**

___ First
___ Second
___ Third
___ Fourth
___ Fifth
___ Sixth or More

4. **Years in Education**

___ 1 - 2
___ 3 - 5
___ 6 - 9
___ 10 - 15
___ 16 - 20
___ Over 20

5. **Educational Setting**

___ School with primarily self-contained program (K-5 or 6, generally)

___ School with primarily departmentalized program (Middle, Junior High or High Schools, generally)

6. Number of Mainstreamed Resource Specialist Program students with whom you presently deal.

_____

RESOURCE SPECIALIST ROLE SURVEY

DIRECTIONS: Please read all the Resource Specialist Role Descriptions below (A - I). Then complete the statements above each response column by ranking from one to nine (1 - 9) all the roles listed.

Column 1: 1 = most important, 9 = least important
Column 2: 1 = most time spent, 9 = least time spent
Column 3: Circle one word for each role.

RESOURCE SPECIALIST ROLE DESCRIPTIONS	I believe the order of importance of each role is...	I believe the amount of time spent on each role is...	I believe the amount of time spent on each role should be...
A. ASSESSMENT (Examples include student observation; selection, administration and interpretation of tests; diagnosis of strengths, weaknesses).			more less same
B. DIRECT INSTRUCTION (Examples include selecting, adapting, developing, preparing and using materials, media, strategies and techniques in cognitive, affective and psychomotor areas.)			more less same
C. COUNSELING (Examples include group and/or individual work in career/vocational, personal, interpersonal, social and self-esteem areas.)			more less same
D. COLLABORATING WITH PARENTS (Examples include communicating, consulting and conferencing about home/school support, student needs, programs, services, resources.)			more less same
E. COLLABORATING WITH EDUCATORS (Examples include communicating, consulting and conferencing with administrators, teachers, support personnel, paraprofessionals about scheduling, curriculum, instruction, behavior, proficiencies, graduation credits.)			more less same
F. COLLABORATING WITH OTHERS (Examples include communicating and consulting with Social Service Agencies, Vocational and Regional Centers, physicians and therapists to collect and/or report student needs, programs, information.)			more less same
G. RESOURCE SPECIALIST PROGRAM MANAGEMENT (Examples include developing, organizing, supervising and maintaining a quality program along with developing, implementing and reviewing each assigned student's Individualized Education Program [IEP].)			more less same
H. SITE SPECIAL EDUCATION LEADERSHIP (Examples include coordinating the school site special education referral process, scheduling IEP meetings, monitoring time lines and legal compliance issues.)			more less same
I. CHANGE AGENT (Examples include promoting awareness, understanding and acceptance of handicapped individuals, mainstreaming and the Resource Specialist Program as well as assisting with staff development and parent education related to special education.)			more less same